V-VI

THE STUDY OF HISTORY

IN

GERMANY AND FRANCE

JOHNS HOPKINS UNIVERSITY STUDIES
IN
HISTORICAL AND POLITICAL SCIENCE

HERBERT B. ADAMS, Editor

History is past Politics and Politics present History — *Freeman*

EIGHTH SERIES

V-VI

THE STUDY OF HISTORY
IN
GERMANY AND FRANCE

BY PAUL FRÉDÉRICQ
Professor in the University of Ghent

Authorized Translation from the French by Henrietta Leonard, of Philadelphia

BALTIMORE
PUBLICATION AGENCY OF THE JOHNS HOPKINS UNIVERSITY
MAY AND JUNE, 1890

COPYRIGHT, 1890, BY N. MURRAY.

JOHN MURPHY & CO., PRINTERS,
BALTIMORE.

EDITORIAL NOTE.

The French titles of Professor Frédéricq's papers are *De l' Enseignement Supérieur de l' Histoire en Allemagne* and *L' Enseignement Supérieur de l' Histoire à Paris. Notes et Impressions de Voyage.* The following translations were made, with Professor Frédéricq's approbation, by Miss Henrietta Leonard, A. B. (Smith College) of Philadelphia. It will be remembered that Miss Leonard also translated Professor Frédéricq's Notes and Impressions concerning Advanced Instruction in History in England and Scotland, published in the University Studies, Fifth Series, X, in October, 1887. Her translation of Frédéricq's Study of History in Belgium and Holland may be expected in the present series in the early summer.

In this connection, as contributing to the object of promoting historical studies in America, the editor begs to note the recent publication in the Papers of the American Historical Association, Vol. IV, Part 1, of President Charles Kendall Adams' Inaugural Address on Recent Historical Work in the Colleges and Universities of Europe and America. This address admirably supplements all previous contributions to the general subject and brings the whole account to the present time.

CONTENTS.

PAGE.

HISTORY IN GERMANY 7
I.—The University of Berlin 7
II.—Universities of Halle, Leipzig and Göttingen—Students' Historical Societies 24
University of Halle 24
University of Leipzig 29
University of Göttingen 33
Historical Societies of Students 36
III.—General Remarks upon the Teaching of History in Germany, 41
HISTORY AT PARIS 55
I.—The College of France 56
II.—The School of Charters 58
III.—The Higher Normal School 66
IV.—The Practical School for Advanced Study 74
V.—The Faculty of Arts, Master's Degree and History Fellowships 94
VI.—Conclusion 110

HISTORY IN GERMANY.

Having obtained from the minister of public instruction leave to visit certain foreign universities for the purpose of investigating their teaching of history, especially in *practical courses*, I made two journeys in the cause, one in 1881 and one in 1882. The pages that follow are merely notes of these visits, not at all pretending to treat the numerous questions which are raised by the distinction between theoretical and practical courses of history. The reader must expect only impressions, which I have reproduced as faithfully as possible.

I.—The University of Berlin.

Omitting ecclesiastical and literary history, history of philosophy, law, arts and sciences, which furnish numerous professorships and numerous practical courses, history proper at the University of Berlin in the summer term of 1881 comprised the following courses: historical encyclopædics and methodology, Grecian paleography, Latin paleography, chronology of the Middle Ages, diplomatics, history of Assyria and Babylon, history of Athenian antiquities, sources of Roman history, military history of feudal times, sources of modern history from 1500–1815, modern history from 1648 to 1763, history of Germany from the Golden Bull to the religious peace of Augsburg (1356–1555), history of political institutions of Germany from the Golden Bull to the

suppression of the empire by Napoleon I (1356–1809), history of Prussia, history of the Seven Years' War, history of France —*sixteen* theoretical courses.

There were six practical courses under the direction of Professors Waitz, Droysen, Mommsen, Bresslau, and the tutors Koser and Delbrück. It must be remembered that the regular number of courses had been reduced by two or three on account of the death of Prof. Nitzsch. Compare this with the meagre program of our Belgian universities which contains, when all are told, seven purely theoretical courses: ancient history, Greek and Roman antiquities, mediæval history, modern history, history of Belgium and contemporary history; this last only since Easter, 1880, and as an optional course included only in the examination for *professeur agrégé* in history, a new degree created in November, 1880.

In the first place I will speak briefly of the theoretical courses I attended in Berlin. The most popular was that of Prof. von Treitschke on the history of France. It was given in a vast, isolated hall, built in the midst of the garden that lies behind the University, and called *Barakken-auditorium*, a name expressive of the architectural simplicity of the great scientific shed. This hall contains 25 long rows of seats; in each row 30 persons could easily be seated, thus making at least 750 auditors seated in the hall. In winter, they told me, the hall was filled at almost all the lectures given by Prof. Treitschke; during the summer term the numbers are smaller. There must have been about 300 at each of the two lectures I attended; among them I noticed one field-officer and a few old gentlemen, as at the Sorbonne, but the great majority were students.

This course of M. von Treitschke's is marvellous. The professor is completely deaf and never hears himself speak; his delivery is extremely monotonous; his voice anxious, sometimes harsh and choked like that of a deaf mute; there is no pause, not even for a second, between the different phrases or parts of a phrase; periods follow one another in close

succession, interrupted from time to time only by his breathing, which usually breaks a phrase in two without any logical reason; his gesture is always the same and his head shakes continually as if from some nervous affection. In spite of his expression of sympathy and majestic kindness, the first impression he makes is very strange. The visitor is inclined to ask how lectures thus given attract such an audience and win such renown throughout Germany.

But at the end of a very few minutes the stranger is under the charm. He forgets the voice, the gesture, the speaker himself; for these confused and anxious phrases, poured out in painful haste, are masterpieces. The listener is carried away by the originality and daring frankness of the ideas, the poetic beauty of their form and the generous warmth of feeling they express. He accepts the strange-sounding voice without further notice, just as one unresistingly submits to the inarticulate and outrageous speech of the Englishman who insists upon using his own mother tongue. The ear once accustomed, the listener sits spellbound up to the moment when M. Treitschke stops speaking with no other warning than his final silence. One ought thus to pass from the first disappointed astonishment to the succeeding enthusiastic admiration in order to appreciate the fascination of this unique course. I leave unmentioned the well-known reputation of this professor. Even those whom he crushes with his hardest criticisms still remain his most earnest auditors. There is, moreover, in his clear eye and his frank, expressive face a good faith that disarms in advance.

I shall long remember M. von Treitschke's lecture on France in the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries. Combining art, religion and politics, he spoke of the French cathedrals of the North and the South and gave a beautiful and strikingly true description of the splendid church of St. Ouen at Rouen. Then in a few words he pictured the naval battle of Sluys, in the midst of which, according to a poetic legend, the Black Prince, seated on a bowsprit, daringly sang a prophecy of the

maritime greatness of England. He then spoke of the popular movements in Paris after the defeat at Poitiers, the first appearance of those periodic convulsions of which the Commune was the latest. He compared Stephen Marcel with Jacques van Artevelde, *der Weber-König*—king of the weavers—and vividly described Ghent and Bruges. He then went on to speak of Pau, and of the Pyrenees, taking occasion to describe the magnificent landscape in view from the Château de Pau. Speaking of Isabelle of Bavaria, he called her "the Bavarian Brunhilde of the fourteenth century," etc. At every step he had a figure or word or picture, always graphic and apt. The last and finest part of this lecture was devoted to Joan of Arc, whom he warmly defended from the sarcasms of Voltaire, comparing her to Garibaldi in our century. "We must pardon such natures everything," he cried, "because they love much." This cold and colorless analysis gives but a faint idea of the charm of M. von Treitschke's extraordinary lectures.

According to the custom of German universities, M. von Treitschke gave two courses; one was free and public, this year on the history of France; the other, to which an admission fee was charged, treated the history of Prussia. This last course was attended by about 50,[1] and was marked by the same brilliant originality, although by less rhetoric, than that on the history of France. One lecture on Wallenstein, Tilly and Gustavus Adolphus was superb. The professor outlined, enthusiastically, the religious and political plans of the great Swedish king, described his death in vivid and even touching words, and spoke from personal remembrance of the tomb of the king in the noble church at Stockholm. One secret of M. von Treitschke's power is his knowledge of all the monu-

[1] One of them puzzled me greatly; holding in his hand a long instrument like a German pipe, he seemed to smoke with his right ear. I learned afterward that he was a deaf man who could hear the lectures by means of this singular apparatus.

ments, towns and battle-fields he speaks of, whose images he calls up in the best chosen words. He has a marvellous plastic power.

While M. von Treitschke is in all the vigor of middle life, M. Gustave Droysen is one of the veterans of advanced teaching in Germany. His courses also are of lively interest. I can see him still, holding in his hand a little blue notebook and leaning on a plain square desk, raised about a half yard above his chair. He commenced in a low voice, after the manner of great French teachers, in order to obtain complete silence. We could have heard the step of a fly. Leaning over his little blue book and turning upon his audience a look that almost shattered his eyeglasses, he spoke of the falsifications of history. It was in his course in encyclopædics and methodology. He spoke with profound disgust of the falsehoods retailed under the name of history, and his habitual expression of nervous discontent added much to the energy and pitiless fire with which he treated his subject, compressing his lips and emitting, from time to time, sighs of scorn and anger. Each moment brought a brilliant witticism, always sharp and biting, and eliciting a discreet smile from every listener. Sometimes he discharged a shot at a historic character, sometimes he jeered at a contemporary scholar, Schliemann, for example, or one of his colleagues, whom he called by name. He treated his subject with great originality, using abundant characteristic examples and diabolical humor, which he apparently wished to hide under a coldly comic manner of speaking. His lecture ended amidst a burst of Homeric laughter, provoked by an irresistible anecdote. I was never so much amused at a university lecture—not much to say, I admit—but, besides, I have rarely heard anything so serious and so solid. I was inclined to cry with Horace: *Omne tulit punctum qui miscuit utile dulci!*

But let no one suppose that all M. Droysen's lectures are pyrotechnic displays of wit, though he uses irony with rare

good humor, and his satirical style greatly enhances the real originality of his ideas.[1]

His course on modern history (1648–1763) was more elementary. As M. Droysen said to me, he was speaking to beginners; nevertheless I admired the caustic humor, the clearness and cleanness of his views, as well as the consummate ease with which the professor read his notes, as if using none. The theoretical course of M. Droysen's is counted among the best in Germany.

Another character at Berlin is Prof. Ernst Curtius, author of the poetic *Griechische Geschichte* which has delighted every specialist. Although thin and below the medium height, M. Curtius vaguely resembles M. Frére-Orban. He has a magnificent head; his features, of rare distinction, are lighted by a calmly radiant expression. He speaks slowly, piling up majestic images and weighing the great adjectives he needs to express all his admiration for Greece.

The hall in which he gives his lectures on Athenian antiquities seems to have been designed especially for the purpose. It is quietly decorated with antique casts, celebrated busts and bas-reliefs. Behind the professor's chair, fastened to the wall, is a great plan of Athens and a long panorama of the town, and of Attica with the sea and the hills sung by the poets. A little further away hangs a fine photograph of the temple of Theseus. All this lends particular attractiveness to the lecture and permits the professor to use the topography of the country. I heard him thus give an excellent lecture on the fortifications of Athens and the fortified walls which connect the city with the ports of Piraeus, Phalerum and Munychia.

Another lecture of M. Curtius's was entirely devoted to the history of Athenian ceramics, from the earliest vases in clay, naïvely marked with the signature of the potter, down to that

[1] I noticed that almost all the students were armed with the professor's manual, *Grundriss der Historik* (2nd ed., Leipzig, 1875), a curious and obscure work, which lacks the brilliant spontaneity of his lectures. [Johann Gustav Droysen died June 19, 1884.]

of the period of decadence, which M. Curtius aptly termed "the Attic rococo." He had brought a portfolio stuffed with drawings, chromolithographs, photographs and reproductions of all sorts, which he distributed amongst the pupils, to support his assertions. When the university clock sounded the hour, it was to the amazement of the whole class; so swiftly and so profitably had the time passed.

M. Curtius had appointed the afternoon for a meeting at the Museum of Antiquities, where he lectures each week on Greek and Roman Archæology. At his arrival the students who were waiting, loitering through the collections, saluted him in silence, and again put on their hats. M. Curtius remained covered also, and straightway commenced his tour of archæological demonstration. Armed with an ivory paper-folder he moved from object to object, explaining, pointing out the slightest peculiarities with the tip of his paper-folder, now standing on tiptoe, now kneeling, the better to complete his explanations. Once he fairly lay upon the ground before a Greek tripod. Supported on his left elbow, and with his right hand brandishing his faithful paper-cutter, he expatiated upon the elegant form and the ravishing decorations of this little *chef-d'œuvre.* It is easy to believe that lectures given with such enthusiasm, and by such a scholar, in a museum of the first rank, would be of great value to the students.

The lecture I heard was concerned with minor points, tripods, candelabra, vases in baked clay, etc.; but, notwithstanding, the professor infused into it a contagious enthusiasm and a perfume of antiquity.

They told me that when M. Curtius took up statuary he soared to the most majestic eloquence; I easily believed it.

Among the other regular professors at the University of Berlin who have attained fame throughout Europe, is the paleographer, M. Wattenbach. He is the most modest and amiable man imaginable. I attended one of his lectures on Latin paleography. Most of the students were provided with the professor's manual, *Anleitung zur lateinischen Palæographie* (3rd

edition, Leipzig, 1878). M. Wattenbach showed the peculiar characteristics of the writing of manuscripts of the fourth and fifth centuries of our era, frequently tracing upon the blackboard the letters of which he was speaking. His lecture was very scholarly, but it was given without the slightest ostentation and with charming good nature.

M. Bresslau is one of the ablest and busiest professors in the University. In the summer terms of 1881, he was giving a course in chronology, one in diplomatics and one in the history of the institutions of the ancient German Empire, besides his practical exercises which I shall mention later.

I could not attend M. Bresslau's lectures on chronology. He takes up the astronomical and technical part of the science, the divers calendars and eras, the problems connected with days, months, festivals and years; the students practice calculating obscure dates by means of a Julian calendar, which the professor gives them with the abstract of his lectures.[1]

I heard two of M. Bresslau's lectures on the history of German institutions. He passed in review the judiciary functions of the ancient German empire. In connection with each office he cited some of those who had filled it and gave a sort of biographical sketch of the most active of them. He spoke with great volubility, nodding his head and darting keen glances at his pupils through his glasses, whose continual sparkling seemed to add animation and encouragement to his words. The amiable and conscientious man continually cited sources and referred to monographs, accurately and methodically. He had an audience of about 60.

His course in diplomatics also seemed to me excellent. The pupils had in hand a collection of Latin charters, published by the professor himself under the title, DIPLOMATA CENTUM *in usum scholarum diplomaticarum edidit et annotationibus illustravit Henricus Bresslau* (Berlin, 1872). M.

[1] *Gundriss zu Vorlesungen über Mittelalterliche Chronologie*, by Harry Bresslau, 2nd ed. fac-simile, Berlin, 1881.

Bresslau commented upon and compared with one another several imperial charters of the Middle Ages, his pupils meanwhile examining the texts. He showed how very important historical consequences can be traced to certain words of an authentic document. He made a minute dissection of the imperial documents and with skilful hand developed results as solid as they were surprising. The pupil who follows such a delicate operation in its minute details must acquire not only sound ideas but, besides, a trustworthy method of using charters in the study of history. These students read the documents and frequently had to answer questions put by the professor. They were thus constantly on the alert and played an active part in the lecture, which was on the border line between didactic theory and practical exercise. I admired the inspiriting vivacity of the professor, transforming the dryest teaching to active and interesting work.

Dr. Koser, tutor (*privat-docent*), devoted four hours a week to the study of sources of modern history from 1500 to 1815. His lecture was full and very conscientious and I learned many things from it. M. Koser estimated correctly the worth of the principal authors who have written upon modern history. I heard him define very clearly the scope of the revolution brought about by Voltaire, who borrowed his new method in his letters on history, in part, from his friend, Lord Bolingbroke. M. Koser then passed in review the official historiographers and gave the history of this singular public function from the fifteenth century. Then he spoke of memoirs relating to modern history and criticised, among others, the *Commentaires* of Charles V, which M. Kervyn de Lettenhove discovered one day at Paris and published. This course of M. Koser's requires an immense amount of study and is an excellent guide for the students.

Dr. Seeck, a tutor, gave a course upon sources of Roman history. The lecture I attended had for its topic a most interesting question: the historical value of Polybius. M. Seeck treated his subject with great clearness, power and remarkable

warmth. Being little versed in ancient history, I dare not pass a fuller criticism. I was pleased to hear that M. Seeck is appointed *professeur extraordinaire* at the University of Greifswald.

All these theoretical courses made a vivid impression upon me; but it was the practical courses which struck me most and at which I fairly marvelled.

I regretted very much that it was impossible for me to attend the *Historische Uebungen* of Prof. Droysen and Prof. Mommsen; but these eminent scholars would grant me no admission. They excused themselves on the ground that their practical courses were open only to matriculates and that the criticism suffered there was too severe and pitiless to permit the presence of a stranger. I also regret that M. Mommsen did not give his theoretical course that summer, and I was thus altogether deprived of hearing the illustrious scholar.

I have no information concerning M. Mommsen's practical course, but it appears in the program under the title *Uebungen aus dem Gebiet der römische Geschichte, privatissime und unentgeltlich.* M. Droysen's was named, *Uebungen der historischen Gesellschaft, öffentlich.* (The last word seemed to me ill-chosen to express the professor's idea.) I am told M. Droysen proceeds as follows: At the beginning of each semester he indicates upon a blackboard, for his picked students, a series of subjects relative to one period, embracing not more than ten, twenty, or thirty years. Twice during the year he changes this field so as to cover during the course all modern history. The students work under his direction to settle vexed questions proposed by the professor, and submit to him papers, which are discussed and carefully criticised. They form thus an historical society, meeting M. Droysen once a week, from six till eight in the evening.

But if I cannot describe the method of M. Mommsen and M. Droysen, fortunately I have learned that of another prince of the science; M. Waitz, the celebrated successor of Pertz in the direction of the *Monumenta Germaniae historica,* very

kindly admitted me to his *historische Uebungen*, although the program named them as given *privatissime*. Formerly a professor at the University of Göttingen, and its glory, he is not a professor at the University of Berlin; but, as a member of the Royal Academy of Sciences, he has the right to teach there. He uses his right generously, giving a familiar practical course. He devotes two hours on Friday evening of each week to this work, and receives his pupils in his study.

M. Waitz is in all the vigor of robust old age (he was born in 1813); with his hair still unwhitened, he seems in the prime of life. His countenance beams with sovereign calm and dignity and marked affability. I cannot tell why he reminded me of an English lord, for he is a native of Holstein. Two mahogany tables were loaded with musty books; around these tables nine students were seated, and M. Waitz took his place upon a sofa near them and commenced the lesson. He was engaged upon a detail of the time of Charles Martel, which they were studying at the same time in the *Gesta Trevirorum*, the *Historia Remensis*, in Flodoard, in the *Vita Rigoberti*, etc. The students were laboring to determine, under Mr. Waitz's direction, to what extent these chronicles were copies one of another, and in what respects they differed. M. Waitz quietly and constantly put his questions, raised objections and came to the rescue of the floundering with perfect tact and unvarying serenity. The most ancient editions of the old chronicles were in the students' hands, intensifying the mediæval savor of this excellent course. Once, when one of the class made a new observation, M. Waitz cried out: "I have learned something myself on a subject I thought I had exhausted!" and drawing his little silver pencil from his pocket, he noted the matter upon the margin of his text. It was touching to see this illustrious old man, whose moments were every one precious, condescending with the utmost graciousness to teach the a b c of historical criticism to timid and inexperienced beginners, receiving them familiarly into his sanctuary, where we could see upon his desk great piles of proof of the *Monumenta* then passing through the press.

The remaining practical courses, directed by Professor Bresslau and by the tutors Koser and Delbrück, were given in the auditorium adjoining the University library, which is on the Dorotheënstrasse, a few minutes' walk from the academic buildings. This auditorium is a large hall, lighted on one side by three fine windows, its other walls tapestried with books. Several flat tables arranged in shape of a T are flanked by fifty chairs, furnishing ample accommodation for the practical courses.

The practical exercises of M. Bresslau are called *Uebungen der Historisch-Diplomatischen Gesellschaft.* This little historical society, analogous to Prof. Droysen's, was originated by Bresslau and is already seven years old. At first it met evenings at the professor's house and numbered only 18 students at most. The death of Prof. Nitzsch having removed one of the most important practical courses, M. Bresslau has temporarily admitted to his historico-diplomatic society the pupils of the deceased. The whole number is about 40. At the beginning of each semester M. Bresslau presents a list of doubtful questions that are to be cleared up. Each student chooses one of these questions and makes it the subject of a thesis which he submits to the professor before the end of the semester. Each thesis is examined by two fellow-students appointed by M. Bresslau, and they make a written report upon it. Finally it is debated orally before all the students.

The exercises take place on Saturdays from eleven o'clock till one. At two of the meetings M. Bresslau permitted me to be present. The pupils were provided with the octavo editions published by Pertz *in usum scholarum ex monumentis Germaniæ historicis.* They were just then upon the *Lamberti Hersfeldensis Annales,* which they carefully compared with the chronicle of Bruno, *De bello Saxonico,* and with other sources of German history at the end of the eleventh century. The appointed pupil had the floor, but the professor constantly put objections and urged the others to do the same. They continually consulted the statements of Prof. von Giesebrecht of

Munich in his great work. M. Bresslau directed the discussion with an air of amusement, putting in occasionally a piquant remark. His forbearance and pleasant familiarity gave a tone of reciprocal sympathy to the work. Sometimes questions and objections would pour together across the table, mingled with ejaculations from the sprightly professor: *Nein! nein!—Unmöglich!—Ach! ganz verkehrt!—Das ist richtig!* The poor chronicler Lambert was pitilessly dissected, and the amount of credence to be accorded him was clearly defined in these two lessons.

In M. Koser's practical course the subject was modern history of Germany, with the *l'Histoire de mon temps*, by Frederick the Great, as a foundation. Sixteen pupils attended the course. They compared the two draughts (1746 and 1775[1]) of these curious memoirs with the correspondence of Frederick II and of Maria Theresa, the diplomatic protocols and other contemporary documents. The appointed pupil had written out his critical observations and now read his work, which was quite extensive. From time to time he was interrupted and points were discussed. All the students had the texts before them. Among the copies which belonged to the students or had been procured at the public libraries of Berlin, was found the first edition of *l'Histoire de mon temps* published in 1788. M. Koser directed the discussions with modesty and great tact. He, too, met his pupils upon a footing of perfect equality. One of them declared that he had examined a certain point with profound scrutiny, whereupon M. Koser exclaimed, "Bravo! Now we shall have something interesting! You have the floor." And the student undertook with a sort of pride to unfold the results of his researches, which were immediately discussed in common. The most recent works, such as M. von Arneth's Maria Theresa, were discussed and some-

[1] *Œuvres de Frédéric le Grand: Œuvres historique*, Berlin, 1846.—*Frederic II, Histoire de mon temps, aus den Kön. Preuss. Staatsarchiven, IV.* Leipzig, 1879.

times corrected, copies in hand. One detail impressed me: professor and students translated at sight the French text of Frederick II, rendering every distinction and without first reading aloud the phrases they translated into German.

The title of M. Delbrück's practical course is, *Uebungen, Einführung in das Studium der Werke Ranke's.* Seven students attended it. It was devoted to a detailed study of the methods of the German prince of history, betraying in what veneration Ranke is held by the universities. I was present at a meeting where the subject was a comparison of the first chapter of Ranke's *Englische Geschichte* with the introduction to Macaulay's *History of England.* M. Delbrück, an enthusiastic admirer of Ranke, pointed out, with malicious satisfaction, the faults of his English rival. I was reminded of the curious articles by Prof. A. Pierson, of Amsterdam, which appeared in the Dutch review, *De Gids,*[1] where the author, comparing Ranke's work with Macaulay's, clearly brings out the superior impartiality and good judgment of the German historian. It seems to me that M. Delbrück, though developing his theme otherwise very justly, put into it a sort of nervous urgency that sometimes confused his pupils. It was, however, a most original course and one calculated to emphasize the multiple duties of a historian. I will conclude these remarks upon the University of Berlin with a few reminiscences which are especially dear to me. I wish to speak of the reception accorded me in the German capital by MM. Ranke, von Sybel, Waitz, Wattenbach and others, in short all the historians it was my privilege to meet.

Prof. Wattenbach, a pupil of Ranke, had assured me that the illustrious veteran took pleasure in the visits of historians of the younger generation and that he would receive me with great kindness, if I would visit him. I did not wait for a second assurance, but presented myself at the house pointed

---

[1] *De Gids,* 1876–77. This review has been in existence since 1837 and is the most important of Dutch reviews. (Amsterdam, van Kampen en zoon).

out to me, *Louisenstrasse* 24ª. I was ushered into a room furnished in the style of 30 years ago and decorated with family portraits and objects of art; among them were a fine oil portrait and a well-executed bust of Ranke himself, gifts of his grateful pupils and admirers. After a few minutes of waiting, there entered a little old man, his abundant hair scattered in disorder and falling all around his magnificent forehead; a white beard, equally luxurious, covered the lower part of his face, and his eyes, under their heavy gray brows, were extraordinarily deep and kind. M. von Ranke was wrapped in an old gray dressing gown and received me, without ado, in a charmingly paternal manner, as if I had been an old pupil. He spoke affectionately of Altmeyer, of M. Gachard and of his other scientific friends in Belgium. For my part, I asked about his universal history, the first volume of which he was issuing, and he proved himself full of hope for the completion of this gigantic work, courageously undertaken so late in life.[1] I spoke of the articles by M. Pierson, of which M. Delbrück's lecture had put me in mind. He was unacquainted with them and seemed flattered by the judgment passed upon his History of England, but he took up with spirit the defense of Macaulay. Then he talked pleasantly with me of Belgium, "that good country which he remembered so well." At the door he took my hand, saying, "*Nun, lebewohl, und schreiben Sie schöne Bücher.*" I shall not forget this short and touching visit. I understood from this gracious reception of a young and nameless stranger, the influence that Ranke has exercised upon his many pupils, creating in them the deepest reverence.

I had a letter from my excellent colleague at Liége, M. Émile de Laveleye, to M. Heinrich von Sybel, the actual direc-

[1] Leopold von Ranke was born in 1795. He is loaded with well-merited honors and is professor at the University of Berlin, but he no longer gives lectures: *Liest nicht* accompanies his name on the university program. His portraits and his bust represented him without beard and with his hair of medium length. [Ranke died May 23; Waitz, May 24, 1886.]

tor of the royal archives of Berlin. The author of a *History of the Period of the French Revolution* received me with the greatest kindness, and permitted me to question him at will upon the origin and development of practical courses in history in German universities. Seating himself familiarly near the sofa where he had placed me, he undertook to relate minutely how Ranke had originated this new method of teaching nearly fifty years before, and how his pupils had propagated the prolific system throughout Germany. I took notes as he spoke, and he would pause from time to time for my convenience. I shall have occasion later to utilize these valuable hints.

I was very anxious to know his opinion of M. Taine's work; he replied quite at length and referred me to his study published in 1879 in the *Deutsche Rundschau*,[1] which has since been included in his *Historische Schriften*. I read it next day at the University Library and I was struck with the clearness and moderation of his criticism.

M. von Sybel is a white-haired man of fifty. He wears a short white beard, and his face, in color like fine yellow vellum, is seamed with long wrinkles. His eyes, which he sometimes half closes with an expression of paternal good will, sparkle with benevolence. It seemed to me that he had something of the bizarre and democratic breeding of a "self-made man" of the United States.

I have already spoken of M. Waitz and his practical course. He received me most cordially both at Berlin and a little later at Dantzig, at the congress of the society for the history of the

[1] In the October number, 1879, M. von Sybel, reviewing the first two volumes of M. Taine's work, praises them highly although he criticises the Frenchman's systematic neglect of German works. M. von Sybel remarks that Taine, like De Tocqueville, appreciated the weak side of the revolutionary centralization but shut his eyes to its advantages. He observes, with a touch of irony, that his opinion expressed twenty years before in his *Geschichte der Revolutionszeit*, and so ill-received in France at the time, is corroborated in M. Taine's book. He points out also some errors. The study is very able.

Hanseatic towns. He spoke of the work of my colleague at Liége, M. Godefroid Kurth, of MM. Gilliodts-van Severen, Limminghe, Ruelens, Alph. Wauters, and Stanislas Boormans. He related casually a little incident of 1880. Needing for the *Monumenta* a manuscript kept at Tournai, he asked for the use of it, never doubting that the answer would be favorable, since Belgium, as he was pleased to say, always stood ready to aid the work of German scholars. But the municipal administration at Tournai, in consenting to the loan of the MS., demanded a deposit of 25,000 francs. M. Waitz preferred to make the trip to Tournai to study the famous document in its stronghold, without paying the deposit. What was his astonishment, upon reaching Tournai, to find that this jealously guarded MS. was to be forwarded to Brussels for the National Exposition. M. Waitz continued his journey to Brussels, and there M. Ch. Ruelens, learned guardian of the manuscripts of the Royal Library, immediately furnished him the document, permitting him to study it at pleasure in his hotel room, far from the jealous eye of the Tournaise officer. While narrating this story, with amusing details, M. Waitz gave me much information upon the practical work in history which well completed that of M. von Sybel.

I owe also to the Professors Wattenbach and Bresslau, M. Koser and M. Paul Bailleu, secretary of the royal archives,[1] acknowledgment of the kindness they showed me during my

[1] M. Paul Bailleu told me that his ancestors were Walloons, who had emigrated to Germany in the sixteenth century to escape the tyranny of the Duke of Alva. At first they settled at Mannheim on the Rhine, but had to flee a second time during the frightful devastation of the Palatinate by Turenne. With other families from the Netherlands they then took refuge in Magdeburg, and there is to-day a Protestant Walloon community in that city of about 1000 members, in which there is sometimes preaching in French. Two other little Walloon churches still survive in Germany, one of which is at Frankfurt. M. Bailleu told me also of a visit he had made in 1880 to the records of Brussels, and of the friendly reception he had met from Piot, Pinchart, Gossart, etc.

stay in Berlin and of the valuable hints they gladly furnished me; especially MM. Bresslau and Koser, whose good nature was inexhaustible.

II.—Universities of Halle, Leipzig and Göttingen—Students' Historical Societies.

I regret keenly that I could not devote to the Universities of Halle, Leipzig and Göttingen as much time as to the University of Berlin. I did, however, visit a considerable number of courses, of which I took hasty notes.

University of Halle.

The programme for the summer term of 1881 contained the following theoretical courses in history: history of the Roman republic, history of Roman Emperors from Augustus to Constantine the Great, history of the Romans and the Germans from Constantine to the invasions of the Barbarians, introduction to the history of Germany, history of the Papacy to the Council of Basle, history of private life up to the Middle Ages, history of Prussia and its institutions, general history of the nineteenth century from the Congress of Vienna (1815).

There were also five practical courses, two of which were devoted to paleography, directed by Professors Dümmler, Droysen, Jr., Schum and Ewald.

I attended one lecture by Prof. Dümmler, one of the most eminent of German scholars. The lecture was in his course on the Roman Republic, touching upon the invasion by the Gauls, the burning of Rome, and the influence of the Etruscans. Prof. Dümmler read his notes in an even voice with a pleasant manner, modest and good natured. Although the following day was the first of the Whitsun-tide holidays, during which for a week students and professors desert the university, a great many were present at the lecture.

Prof. Droysen, Jr., son of Droysen of Berlin, gave a course in contemporary history from the time of the Congress of

Vienna, and the lecture I heard bore upon the policy of England before and after Waterloo. M. Droysen is one of the most attractive professors that I listened to. His delivery is animated and carries conviction as much through his eyes and gesture as through his words. The students did not all write with feverish haste as in Belgium; they contented themselves, for the most part, with a single note now and then, following the professor's train of reasoning with their eyes fixed upon his face. This remark applies to all the lectures I heard in Germany; the students really listened, while with us they scarcely think at all, so eager are they to write down with the accuracy of a stenographer every word of the professor, so as to be able to learn them by heart for the examination.

In Prof. Schum's course upon the Papacy in the Middle Ages, I heard him describe the scandals of the Popes in the eleventh century in vigorous terms. He spoke in a clear and penetrating voice, casting at his audience stern and impressive glances, which enhanced the strict impartiality with which he treated his delicate subject.

Prof. Hertzberg, distinguished as a specialist and author of a great work upon his subject, taught history of the Roman Empire. He was describing, the day I heard him, the details of military organization of the Eastern and Western Empires, and the working of the postal system in the two empires.

I was able, also, to hear, while at Halle, one of Prof. Kirchoff's brilliant lectures on geography. In the programs this course is called "Study of Asiatic Regions." The professor placed himself in front of the desk by a table heaped with charts and atlases. A beautiful physical map of Asia was stretched upon the wall. He was speaking of the Caucasus region and he rapidly and brilliantly characterized in an able sketch the flora and fauna of the region. Then he passed on to the ethnography of the country, quoting ceaselessly, and often in Greek, Herodotus, Strabo, Hippocrates, etc., in the same breath with the most recent geographers, such as M. Elysée Reclus.

There is no such advanced study of geography in Belgium save at the Normal School of Arts at Liége since 1852. I did not get a very clear idea of this teaching of geography, but Prof. Kirchoff's learned, sound, comprehensive and graphic lecture showed me the importance that ought to be given to the science in our universities when the day comes for serious reorganization.[1] At Halle, two professors, Kirchoff and Credner, give six courses in geography. The courses may be enumerated thus: methodology of the science, study of the earth's surface and the causes that determined it, study of Asiatic regions, geography of the south of Germany, description of the most important and most recent geographical discoveries, practical work in geography. All Prussian universities and generally all German universities have courses in the science analogous to those of Halle.

I visited only one of the five practical courses in history, that of Prof. Droysen, which is one of the two official seminaries of history belonging to the University of Halle. The eminent professor proceeds as follows: He has, printed or in autograph, some of the sources that are to be worked for a special point in modern history which he wishes to clear up. The little pamphlet is given out to the students and one of them is specially charged to solve the difficulty; he presents a report and they all discuss for several meetings the relative value of the sources and the manner in which historians have used them. The subject under discussion at my visit was the capture of Frankfort-on-the-Oder by Gustavus Adolphus in 1631. Eleven students sat at the sides of a long table at the head of which sat the professor. Each pupil had before him the letters of the Swedish king, of Gen. Banner, etc., besides little contemporary pamphlets relating to the event, published according to the usage of the time. The originals of these

[1] Prof. Sequarri, my colleague at Liége, announced, for the summer term of 1882, a free course in geography; this was the first attempt to introduce the study into our faculties of arts and letters.

documents lay upon the table and were occasionally referred to. The discussion was most earnest and the pupils took part in it without waiting to be asked. M. Droysen controlled the debate gracefully and followed it with intense and encouraging interest. I cannot forget that remarkable head, the high forehead crowned with white hair, while his mustache is still black. I have already expressed my admiration of this man, and his practical course seemed to me even more excellent than his others.

Prof. Droysen's most advanced pupils sometimes undertake more extensive work and this they submit in manuscript. For the past eight years the professor has had the best of these papers printed by the editor, Max Niemeyer, of Halle, who does the work at his own expense. In June, 1881, thirteen of these monographs had appeared and five more were in press or in preparation. Those printed since 1874 bore the title, "Halle dissertations upon modern history, edited by G. Droysen."

Professor Dümmler conducts the other historical seminary. Although I was unable to visit it, I took care to ask the opinion of so eminent a scholar in regard to practical courses. He gave me many valuable hints which I shall use, and received me with great kindness. He spoke to me, among other things, of one of my pupils at Liége, M. Henri Pirenne, who was then studying, under direction of my colleague M. Kurth, the history of Sedulius Scotus, and had been corresponding with Prof. Dümmler upon the subject.

I would have given much to visit the classes of Prof. Schum in paleography and diplomatics; but I had time only to glance over the fine collection of fac-similes that he has prepared. He has placed in a room, designed specially for his course, all the paleographic publications of Germany, France, England and Italy for the use of his pupils; beside these, he has copied, with his own hand, a great number of charters from the archives of Germany, Belgium, France and Italy, so that at the practical exercises each student has before him a copy of

the document he is studying. In the summer term of 1880 Prof. Schum had his pupils make a classification of the archives of a church; the *Regesta* will soon appear. It is an excellent method of initiating students into the complex science of the archivist. The professor takes a little excursion with his pupils every year to the apparently very interesting records of Merseburg. The day is divided between the record office and the monuments of the town. I was very much struck with this sort of teaching; for it is easy to see that with so competent a master, so sound a method and such complete apparatus, rich results would be obtained.[1]

I had the honor of meeting the professor of Political Economy, M. Conrad, and he gave me interesting details about the organization of his practical course. His information happened to be exactly the same that Prof. Ad. Wagner, Prince Bismarck's economic adviser, had given me in Berlin, a point I cannot forbear mentioning, although it does not directly concern my subject, because it may help to introduce into our own universities those practical courses in Political Economy that are found to be, in all German Universities, a great help to historians.

[1] Prof. Schum spoke at length of the valuable collection of MSS. at the Erfurt library, of which he had undertaken to make a catalogue. The manuscripts are chiefly a bequest made in 1412 by a physician named Amplonius, who had collected them throughout Europe. He had secured thus the manuscripts of Jan de Wasia, curate of St. Walburge, at Bruges, in the fourteenth century, who had himself bought them at the death of a canon of St. Donat in the same city. They treat of mathematical and theological subjects. None are in Flemish, but upon the cover of one of them Prof. Schum found a fragment of a Flemish parish account of the fourteenth century, of which he gave me a copy. I was anxious to send it to M. Napoléon de Pauw, state attorney at Bruges, who is editing the parish records of the time of the Arteveldes. M. Pauw readily recognized it as a fragment of the records of Bruges. The *Bibliotheca Amploniana* contains also a medical treatise of the middle of the fourteenth century whose exact title is as follows: *Johannis de Burgondia, alias dicti cum barba, civis Leodiensis et artis medicinæ professoris et physici Tractatus de epidemiis.* (Cod., No. 192, fr. 146–148). I mention it for the sake of those who are studying the history of the old principality of Liége.

At the library I found Prof. Hartwig, who has charge of it. It is a model structure, built almost entirely of iron, and hence fireproof. M. Hartwig did the honors of his establishment with great affability, and allowed me to rummage at will through the books pertaining to the Netherlands.[1] I have rarely met men of such cordial and winning frankness.

I owe to Prof. Schum my chief acknowledgment. He put himself at my disposal during my stay in Halle and helped me in all my investigations. He treated me like an old friend and showed me the brotherly hospitality that is most keenly felt in a foreign land, protesting that he was only paying his debt to M. Schoonbroodt, the State Archivist at Liége, and his colleagues for their kindness to him when he went to make his copies of mediæval charters.

University of Leipzig.

In the summer term of 1881 there were the following eleven theoretical courses in history: sources of Greek and Roman history; diplomatics, with an introduction on Latin paleography; history of Greece up to Alexander the Great; Roman history up to the Empire; history of the Carlovingian and German empires to the Hohenstaufen; history of Europe at the end of the Middle Ages; history of Europe at the time of the Reformation; history of Europe from the peace of Hubertsburg to the fall of Napoleon I; history of Saxony (two courses); history of civilization in Germany since the Reformation.[2]

The practical courses in history, five in number, were under the direction of Prof. von Noorden, Prof. Arndt and Prof. Gardthausen and the privat-docents Holzapfel and Meyer.

[1] I even found there some works of whose existence I was quite ignorant.

[2] To these must be added a course in Latin epigraphy, one in paleography with practical training, and four theoretical courses in geography (general geography, special ethnography, history of the exploration and colonization of Africa, and geography of the fauna and flora of the globe). There were two practical courses in geography, besides.

I had but one day for the great Saxon University, though its teaching of history deserves to be carefully studied. I went to two practical exercises. They constitute, as at Halle, a State seminary, that is to say, they have received official recognition, especially in subsidies. This seminary consists of four sections, under the care of three professors and M. Meyer. Since 1877 the seminary has had a building of its own, enlarged in 1880 and composed of five halls; a study for the professor, a little room where atlases and the great geographical, paleographical and epigraphical collections are kept in closets, and three large work halls where the students consult encyclopædias in current use (often in duplicate and triplicate), and where each pupil has a separate large table with a drawer whose key he keeps. Each table is lighted by a separate gas-jet. The students are allowed to smoke in the afternoon; in the morning they must obtain the unanimous consent of the students present. The hall, warmed in winter, is at the disposal of the students from 9 a. m. till 10 p. m. It is always locked to prevent the entrance of intruders, but each student has a latch-key.[1] To have the use of the building it is necessary to become a member of the historical seminary, that is, to be accepted by one of the professors and to pay ten marks a term to a special library. All but serious students are thus excluded.

Prof. von Noorden first started this system at Bonn and then introduced the same reform at Leipzig. The government of Saxony granted him the sum of 6,500 marks for the foundation of the library and an annual subsidy of 1,200 marks. The income from the students at ten marks each amounts to 800 or 900 marks a year, inasmuch as there are forty or fifty members admitted each term. One of them acts as librarian and receives about 100 francs.

I visited Prof. von Noorden's practical course in sources of

[1] It seems that this room at Leipzig is the most complete in all Germany those at Bonn and Strasburg are far smaller, I am told.

German history of the tenth century, especially Widukind and Hroswitha. About twenty students were present, one of them a young lady. She wore a simple dark dress, brightened by a red necktie, and was bravely seated at the common table between two of the students. It was evident that no one thought of finding fault with her.[1]

The *Carmen* of Hroswitha, with its preface and two dedications, one to Otho I and the other to Otho II, was the subject of debate and all the pupils had carefully prepared for it. Prof. von Noorden put questions and directed the discussion with nervous care; it was very spirited and interesting. At the end the professor gave out the subject of the next *séance*, first indicating the exact volume and page of the sources to be consulted and then enumerating the points upon which the discussion would bear. Each pupil wrote the order of the day as the professor dictated it.[2]

The same evening Prof. Gardthausen had his practical course in ancient history. He began by deploring the singular disregard the Greek and Roman historians had for inscriptions and official documents which were within their reach, but which have been almost entirely destroyed in the centuries since. He then proceeded to compare the speech of the Emperor Claudius

---

[1] The university at Leipzig admits women to its lectures, but excludes them from the examinations. Göttingen, on the contrary, occasionally confers a degree upon a woman, but does not admit them to lectures. In Switzerland, notably at Berne, no difference is made between the sexes. M. von Noorden told me that one young woman had taken his practical course in history during the preceding year and was by far his best pupil. Not being able to take her degree at Leipzig, she went to Berne with her first teacher, Prof. Stern. She is now professor at the Victoria-Lyceum for women at Berlin.

[2] M. von Noorden does not require written theses from his pupils. If a particularly studious pupil produces one, it is handed to a referee who writes out his criticism. The professor then calls a special meeting of the seminary, say Sunday morning, and the thesis is subjected to pitiless examination.

in Tacitus (*Annales*, XI, ch. 25) with the official version that has been preserved in the inscriptions found at Lyons in 1528.

There were five pupils present and each had the passage from Tacitus before him, as also the text of the inscription. One student gave a minute *résumé* of the argument put by the Latin historian into the mouth of Claudius, while another translated the real argument. Finally the version of the same speech, as given by Suetonius, was examined and reference made to Mommsen. The discussion was kept close to the point and was most instructive.

Prof. Arndt's practical course was given in the morning, once a week, from 7 to 9 o'clock. I could not attend it but Prof. Arndt described to me his method, which seemed to me very original. He took from preference beginners, students in their first university term. For some weeks he requires them to devote their time to acquiring a general knowledge of the German Middle Ages, and the condition of Europe as a whole at that time. He suggests some works for them to read at the seminary library. The order of the day for the practical *séance* is not known beforehand. For instance, at the beginning of the lesson, the professor writes on the blackboard some enigmatical words which the pupils are to decipher while he puts questions. As the subject opens before them they ask for sources to be consulted and immediately consult them; they find the necessary documents upon the shelves of the special seminary library. Again it may be a charter of the Middle Ages which the professor submits to his pupils, of which they must discover the import, referring for difficult points to special works. Each pupil is thus taken without means for preparation and has to depend upon himself for better or for worse, like an officer upon the battlefield. Even the most mediocre minds are bound to make a great intellectual effort and are thus roused from their apathy.

The students are not allowed to take notes or to write at all during the lesson; all attention must be concentrated upon the unstudied question of the hour. When a student wishes to

present a written dissertation[1] he goes to the professor and submits to him his subject. When the work is done the professor in his study criticizes it for the author.[2] The practical work remains exclusively oral and the professor keeps strictly to the Socratic method. Prof. Arndt spoke earnestly in favor of his system. He told me also of specialists whom he had formerly met in Belgium, of Ferd. Vanderhaeghen and the late Senator Vergauwen at Ghent, and of the incunabula belonging to the University library and to M. Vergauwen. He spoke, too, of M. Schoonbroodt and the late Ferd. Hénaux, at Liége, where he had consulted the famous *Codex Leodiensis* for the *Monumenta*, etc.

The reception accorded me at Leipzig by Profs. Arndt, von Noorden and Gardthausen was most pleasant. I regretted exceedingly that I had to leave their university so soon.

University of Göttingen.

The list of theoretical courses in history given during the summer term of 1881 is as follows: diplomatics; Latin pale-

---

[1] Following the lead of Prof. Droysen, Jr., at Halle, eight years before, some of the professors undertook in 1880 to publish the best of their pupils' monographs, through Veit of Leipzig, in a series called *Historiche Studien*, edited by W. Arndt, C. von Noorden and G. Voigt in Leipzig, B. Erdmannsdörffer and E. Winkelmann in Heidelberg, W. Maurenbrecher and M. Ritter in Bonn, R. Pauli and J. Weizsäcker in Göttingen, and C. Varrentrapp in Marburg. In June, 1881, four monographs had appeared, with a preface by the professor under whom the work had been done, and three were in press.

[2] In Germany the professors are at the disposal of their students every day at a certain hour called *Sprech-stunde*. The consultation is gratuitous, and the students make use of it freely. When the porter at the university gives a stranger the professor's address, he gives at the same time his *Sprech-stunde*. The official lecture programme at Leipzig gives opposite each professor's days and hours of lectures the exact hour of his *Sprech-stunde*. At that hour it is impossible to visit a German professor without finding his study and his waiting-room in possession of one or more students. This is the way they train pupils. The *Sprech-stunde* ought to be introduced into Belgium.

ography; Roman history to the time of Sulla; history of Roman institutions; history of the German Empire up to the great interregnum; contemporary history from 1815, with special reference to institutions; history of Great Britain and of Parliament; history of Italy in the Middle Ages.[1]

There were five practical courses in history under Profs. Pauli, Weizsäcker, Volquardsen and Steindorff and the tutor Bernheim. Prof. Pauli, who has lived many years in England and has written one of the best histories of that country and knows it thoroughly, gives a course in his favorite subject. The lecture I attended was upon India and the English colonies in Hindostan. The professor outlined the history of the great peninsula before its conquest by the Europeans, related the origin of the East India Company in the reign of Elizabeth, and the struggle between the French and English under Labourdonnaye, Dupleix, Lord Clive, Lally Tottendal, etc. The professor was master of his subject and presented it in a very interesting style. Twelve pupils were present.

In his course upon the German Empire, Prof. Weizsäcker[2] described the important rôle played by Otho the Great, in Italy, at the time when the Saxon emperor controlled the papacy. The professor adorned his narrative with many piquant remarks. He cited sources constantly and referred with criticisms to the great historical works and to special monographs. This learned and spirited lecture was attended by about 40 students.

I visited, also, Prof. Weizsäcker's practical course. It is ordinarily given at the professor's house, but this time at one of the University halls on account of the severe illness of some member of the professor's household. At the appointed hour Prof. Weizsäcker arrived, followed by a stout German servant

---

[1] The four courses in geography consist of the following subjects: General geography and climatology, geography and statistics of the German Empire, methods of teaching geography, and practical courses.

[2] Prof. Weizsäcker has since been appointed professor at the University of Berlin. [Reinhold Pauli died June 3, 1882.]

of mature years, who carried, with bare arms, a great osier basket filled with copies of the *Monumenta* and other necessary books. The entrance of the brave woman excited no attention; not one of the 20 students smiled. The professor settled himself in his chair and launched out into a humorous discourse that lasted two hours and was truly ravishing. He began by stating his ideas in regard to the qualities that ought to be found in a student's written thesis. In this connection he recalled the precept of v. Sybel: "However small the question may be, you must attack it vigorously and write out your work only when you have convinced yourself that, upon that subject, you are the wisest man in the world." Prof. Weizsäcker then suggested, as a subject for study, the obscurity which still surrounds the strange ceremonies of the election of German kings at Frankfurt and their coronation during the Middle Ages. After speaking in this vein for an hour, scattering pleasantry and sending a smile of amusement around the class at each sally, he distributed copies of the first volume of the acts of the German Diets, of which he is the editor.[1] When each student had received his copy, the professor began to comment upon some of the Bulls of Popes Clement III and Urban II, who, one at Rome and the other at Avignon, each pretended to be the true pontiff. The second hour was spent thus, the students remaining silent, the professor waxing more and more keen and interesting. At the close he remarked playfully that he had forgotten that he was doing all of the talking, possessed, in spite of himself, by the influence of the chair he sat in. He expressed the hope of resuming the lessons in his own study and dismissed his pupils kindly, begging one of them to replace all the musty books in the basket so that the servant might carry them back. I was so delighted with his brilliant lecture that I regretted extremely my inability to see him at work directing a historical debate.

---

[1] *Deutsche Reichstagsakten I. unter König Wenzel* (1376–1387), edited by Julius Weizsäcker, Munich, 1867.

I talked a long time with Profs. Pauli and Weizsäcker about the organization of practical courses, and obtained also the opinion of Prof. Steindorff, son-in-law of Dr. Waitz. To the latter Göttingen is indebted for its historical renown and the traditions which he left have made the university one of the best in Germany for the study of history.

As at Berlin, Halle and Leipzig the reception I met was extremely cordial and pleasant to remember. Prof. Pauli, especially, whom I had met a few days before at the Congress of the Hanseatic Society, in Dantzig, was kind and hospitable.

Historical Societies of Students.

There exists at the German Universities, along with the theoretical and practical courses in history, an interesting institution which serves to complement them—the societies composed exclusively of students. I visited them hastily at Berlin, Halle and Göttingen, and found them so useful as to deserve special mention here.

At Berlin the *Historische Verein* holds its meetings in the fine parlor of a restaurant situated in *Unter den Linden*. The room is adorned with portraits of the Emperor William, the Prince Imperial, Bismarck, etc., and is lighted by a magnificent chandelier with sixteen gas-jets. About 20 students were present, drank Nuremberg beer and smoked energetically. First they passed, by a small majority, an amendment imposing a fine for absence. Then the *Vortrag* began; that is, one of the students addressed the company. While he was speaking the rest smoked and drank, though listening carefully, made grave signs of salutation across the table and drank one another's health at great distances. The privat-docent Koser, who had introduced me into the circle, and I, were several times the objects of this silent and apparently most flattering demonstration; usage requires that the one honored by the silent toast should after a little while make the sign from afar and drink to the health of the one who saluted him.

The *Vortrag* was very interesting; its theme was the Black Death in the fourteenth century. The student who made the address, M. Hoeniger, had just won his doctor's degree by a thesis on the same subject.[1] A pile of notes lay upon the little desk behind which the speaker stood. He quoted mediæval sources extensively, among others the *Corpus Chronicorum Flandriæ* of the late Canon De Smet. The students were all so serious and attentive you would have fancied yourself in a small academy.

We could not stay till the end of the meeting, and at our departure we were requested to sign a register of the visitors admitted. Most of the professors had at various times attended the meetings. This fraternal intercourse of master and pupils upon scientific ground, glass in hand and pipe in mouth, impressed me much.

At Halle, where there are a great many poor students, the *Akademisch-historische Verein* had more modest quarters. They used a small room in a sort of old-fashioned inn, called *Restaurant Hoffmann*, the door opening upon the wide porch. The only ornament in the room was a cast-iron stove, such as is seen at Arles and in the Grand Duchy. Seven students were present at the meeting, smoking and drinking healths in beer, and Prof. Schum and I came in for our share of the silent homage. Several members read reviews of recent articles in Prof. von Treitschke's *Preussische Jahrbücher* and in M. von Sybel's *Historische Zeitschrift*. The listeners did not hesitate to exchange observations upon the monographs. In this manner they discussed quite seriously a work by Prof. Nitzsch

[1] This is the title of it: *Gang und Verbreitung des schwarzen Todes in Deutschland von* 1348–1351 *und sein Zusammenhang mit den Judenverfolgungen und Geisselfahrten dieser Jahre. Inaugural-Dissertation zur Erlangung der philosophischen Doctorwürde an der Georgia Augusta zu Göttingen von Robert Hoeniger aus Ratibon.* (Berlin, 1881). The monograph is only 46 pages, but M. Hoeniger has just developed it into a valuable book, which I recommend to all students of the fourteenth century, (*Der schwarz Tod in Deutschland. Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte des vierzehnten Jahrhunderts.* Berlin, Eug. Grosser, 1882, 180 pages).

upon the mediæval Truces of God, beginning with that of the Bishop of Verdun in the eleventh century. This plan of keeping in touch with the best articles of historical reviews ought to produce many good results. At the close the president rose, proposed our health and commanded a "Salamander" in our honor:[1] this drew forth our thanks and our proposal, in turn, of a Salamander to the health of the society.

At Göttingen I was introduced to the students' history club by Prof. Weizsäcker and the tutors, Bernheim and Schmarsow. The room was a large parlor on the first floor of *Restaurant Ernst*. It was in June, the evening was exceptionally fine and the three windows, looking out upon one of the principal streets, were open all the time. Eleven students were present, one of whom wore a military uniform.

It is needless to say that everyone was smoking and drinking beer. One student gave a lecture full of humorous sallies upon the history of Göttingen. I learned that the university was founded in 1743, after the religious wars of the sixteenth century and the Thirty Years' War had completely ruined this flourishing Hanseatic town; the university was intended to revive it, as that of Louvain was to be a compensation for the ruin of the industries and commerce of the town.[2] The lecturer dwelt especially upon the revolutions which disturbed Göttingen in 1830–1831, and submitted to his audience a collection of pamphlets and proclamations of the time, borrowed from the University library, the richest library in all

---

[1] A "Salamander" is as follows: The president exclaims "*Ad exercitium Salamandri!* one, two, three!" Then every one raps his glass upon the table, making as much noise as he can without breaking it, and empties it to the health of the one to whom the Salamander is offered. A second knocking of glasses upon the table is the epilogue. It is all done with a seriousness that is quite comical. It seems there is another form of Salamander, more complicated and solemn, for great occasions.

[2] It would be a curious study to discover all the motives that have led to the establishment of universities in all civilized countries from the fourteenth century till now.

Germany. The lecture was interesting and the speaker had made original investigation.

The president rose immediately upon the close of the lecture and pronounced the ceremonial formula, *Incipit fidelitas*, which marked the end of scientific work and the descent to less serious matters. Each student was given a *Commerzbuch*, a collection of German songs; the president gave out the song to be sung and all began it in chorus, as they sing the psalm in a Protestant church at the request of the preacher. They sang first, *Stosst an, Göttingen soll leben!* in honor of the university, with the proud refrain, *Frei ist der Bursche!* After each song every man laid his *Commerzbuch*—I should say "hymn-book"—upon the table and shut it carefully under penalty of emptying his glass at one draught, a forfeit I had to pay after the first song, in my ignorance of the good old tradition. All sorts of songs were thus sung with the same ceremony; most of them were beautiful in words as well as melody. The famous *Gaudeamus igitur* was not slighted and healths to the professors present and their responses alternated with the songs. Prof. Weizsäcker's toast to me was characteristic; he drank to "that which ought to be dearer to me than anything else in the world, my practical course at the University of Liége." This toast was endorsed by an uproarious Salamander, which the president gravely commanded. But it was scarcely finished when the hour came to leave, for night meetings are under strict rule at Göttingen: there is no jesting with authority when once the *Polizeitstunde* has sounded. They told me in this connection the story of a riot raised by the students on account of the enforcement of the regulations by the police.

Such is the impression I have of the three societies of students which I had the chance to visit. To show their organization more precisely I translate here some of the by-laws of the *Akademisch-historische Verein* at Halle; there are no less than 55 articles, forming a printed pamphlet of seven pages.

"Art. 1. The aim of the society is to encourage the study of history among its members.

"Art. 2. To attain this end there shall be: 1st, a weekly meeting; 2nd, a historical library; 3rd, special reviews, passed from hand to hand.

"Art. 4. Any man shall be eligible to active membership who is a student in history in the faculty of philosophy at Halle.

"Art. 10. Each active member engages: 1st, to give at least one lecture in the course of each semester; 2d, to pay a monthly fee of 75 pfennige; 3rd, to pay the regular forfeits.

"Art. 24. The order of business for each meeting shall be: 1st, administrative part: the secretary calls the roll and reads the minutes of the last meeting; questions of internal management; communications from the president. 2nd, scientific part: lecture (*Vortrag*); discussion of lecture; appointment of following lecture; reports upon contents of historical reviews.

"Art. 28. The lecturer shall have his subject announced a month before the meeting; it must be historical.

"Art. 29. The president shall designate beforehand the 'referee,' that is, the person who shall have the responsibility of studying up the question and discussing it with the lecturer.

"Art. 49. The library shall consist of great historical works, discussions, and 'programs' and reviews.

"Art. 50. The society shall subscribe to at least the *Historische Zeitschrift* and *Forschungen zur deutschen Geschichte.*

"Art. 53. The librarian shall distribute to members in turn the reviews as they appear. Each member may keep a book not more than eight days. He who receives the review first shall give a *résumé* of its contents at the meeting following."

It seems to me evident that these clubs must have a good influence upon the special study of the members. They must consist of a picked few, since from the Universities of Berlin, Halle and Göttingen, numbering respectively 3,700, 1,300 and 1,000 students the number of members in the societies ranges only from 10 to 20.

In aiding one another to keep pace with the most recent works, in giving practice at demonstrating to others the conclusions reached by one and in maintaining relations at the

same time serious and convivial between fellow-students, the societies are surely excellent institutions. It seems to me they are, so to speak, little nurseries of future historians. It would be an advance to introduce them into our universities and among the normalists of our history section.[1] There is no doubt that the professors in Belgium would be glad to lend them the moral support which is generously accorded them by the most distinguished German-teachers.

III.—General Remarks upon the Teaching of History in Germany.

Returning from Göttingen to Belgium, I found myself in company with M. von Ihering, the author of *The Spirit of Roman Law*, which a Belgian judge, M. O. de Meulenaere, has translated into French. This distinguished professor told me that he had just received the last number of the *Revue internationale de l'enseignement*, containing a remarkable study upon history in the German universities.

The article, by M. Charles Seignobos, lecturer at the Faculty of Arts at Dijon, is full of curious information and original reflections.[2] It reviews the auditory of the history courses, the professors, the subjects taught, the methods of teaching, the practical courses, the auxiliary sciences, the libraries, the examinations, and the general character of the history teaching. To be sure, some exception[3] might be taken to the keen observations and somewhat severe judgments of the author, but, for going to the bottom of things without euphemism or

---

[1] I am happy to be able to add here that a students' historical society has existed at Liége for a year past. It has 30 members.

[2] *L'Enseignement de l'histoire dans les universités allemandes.* (In the *Revue internationale de l'enseignement*, I, No. 6, 15th June, 1881, pp. 563–600.)

[3] To escape responsibility in publishing the article by M. Seignobos the editor of the Review speaks of it as "a study of great interest, but one to which we should take, personally, many exceptions" (p. 563, note).

concealment, he deserves the thanks of all who wish to profit by the experience of Germany, in revolutionizing the study of history in their own countries.

I do not pretend to know the subject as well as does M. Seignobos, for he has evidently made a long and deep study of it. I give my observations for what they are—merely notes, taken from day to day, and passing impressions. It will be necessary, however, for me to condense into the most general statements all I saw and heard in my tour through Germany. I will avail myself, above all, of the information I had from the very lips of certain masters who have largely contributed to make the teaching what it now is.

And first of all, it will be well to give a statement of the various subjects which constitute the courses in history in the universities of the German Empire and, in general, of all German-speaking countries. In reality, the universities of Austria and Germanic Switzerland, as well as the Russian university of Dorpat, have adopted substantially the same organization as is found in Germany proper.

The following table will present, at a glance, the situation as it was when I made my visit. I would remark that the table does not embrace all the German-speaking universities. Those which do not appear there had, in 1881, less than seven courses in history. They were: Wurzburg, Giessen, Marburg and Grätz, which had six; Erlangen and Friburg-im Brisgau, which had four; and Rostock, which had only two.

The first feature of this table is the great variety of subjects treated in the different universities. Besides ancient, mediæval and modern history, history of Germany, the common fatherland, and the history of each particular nation, there are courses in history of France, of England, of Italy and the Papacy, etc.; and this wide range is itself completely renewed every term, since each professor changes his course every six months.

Table of the History Courses Offered in the Summer Term of 1881.

German Universities.	General History.	History of Oriental Peoples.	Greek and Roman History.	Middle Ages.	Modern Times.	Contemporary History.	German History.	History of Particular Nations.	French History.	English History.	History of Italy and the Papacy.	Encyclopædias, Methodology and Sources.	Diplomatics.	Paleography.	Practical Courses.	Total.	Courses in Geography.
Berlin	.....	1	3	1	1	.....	3	1 Prussia.	1	.....	.....	3	2[1]	3	7	26	2
Leipzig	.....	.....	3	1	2	.....	1	2 Saxony.	.....	.....	.....	1	2	2	7	21	3
Breslau	.....	.....	2	.....	1	1	2	1 Prussia.	1	.....	1	1	.....	.....	6	16	2
Bonn	.....	.....	2	.....	1	.....	3	.....	.....	.....	.....	3	1	1	4	15	2
Göttingen	.....	.....	3	.....	.....	1	1	.....	.....	1	1	.....	1	1	5	14	4
Halle	.....	.....	3	1	.....	1	1	1 Prussia.	.....	.....	1	.....	1	1	3	13	6
Heidelberg	.....	.....	.....	1	.....	1	1	1 Prussia.	2	1	1	1	1	1	2	13	.....
Tübingen	1	.....	1	1	.....	2	2	.....	.....	.....	.....	1	.....	1	4	13	.....
Zürich	1	.....	1	.....	.....	1	.....	6 Switzerland.	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	4	13	3
Vienna	4[2]	1	1	1	.....	.....	.....	1 Austria.	.....	.....	.....	3	.....	.....	.....	12	2
Königsberg	.....	.....	4	.....	1	1	1	.....	1	.....	1	.....	1	1	3	11	2
Bâle	.....	.....	1	1	2	.....	.....	2 Switzerland.	.....	.....	.....	1	.....	1	3	11	.....
Prague	1	.....	1	.....	1	1	.....	4 Austria. 1 Bohemia.	.....	.....	.....	.....	1	1	.....	11	2
Munich	.....	.....	1	.....	.....	1	1	.....	.....	.....	1	1	1	.....	2	8	.....
Jena	.....	.....	1	.....	1	1	1	.....	1	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	3	8	3
Berne	.....	.....	.....	1	.....	1	.....	2 Switzerland.	.....	.....	.....	.....	1	.....	3	8	.....
Münster	.....	1	1	3	.....	1	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	2	8	.....
Dorpat	.....	.....	.....	.....	1	1 Russ	.....	1 Russia. 1 Livonia.	.....	.....	.....	2	.....	.....	3	8	.....
Strasburg	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	1	1	.....	.....	.....	.....	1	1	.....	3	7	5
Greifswald	.....	.....	2	.....	.....	1	.....	1 Prussia.	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	3	7	2
Kiel	.....	.....	1	1	.....	.....	1	.....	1	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	3	7	3
Innspruck	2	.....	.....	1	.....	.....	.....	1 Austria.	.....	.....	.....	1	1	1	.....	7	1
Czernowitz	.....	.....	.....	2	.....	.....	.....	2 Austria.	.....	.....	1	.....	.....	.....	2	7	1

[1] I have included in this number, in order to avoid making a separate column, M. Bresslau's course in Chronology. It was the only one in all Germany in 1881. [2] The University Calendar (Summer, 1881) from which I took these facts is not very explicit. I have classed as general history three courses at Vienna marked simply *Geschichte*.

Another point of the greatest importance is, that, with rare exceptions, each course covers only a very short period[1] enabling the professor to go into the depths of his subject, and to dispense with generalities which teach good students nothing. In Belgium we have too many superficial courses, like manuals for the use of beginners, since they try to cover all ancient history or all mediæval history, and so on. I know that several Belgian professors have already rebelled against this superannuated tradition and prefer to choose every year, from the vast field that is allotted them, certain questions and certain periods which they can study more closely and more scientifically; but the old system is still the rule and lowers our advanced teaching to the level of academic teaching, as M. Bréal pointed out some years ago.

But to return to our table. It is astonishing to note that in this infinite variety there are two subjects that seem to be considered indispensable, since, notwithstanding the extreme freedom of choice used in making out the programs, they are found in nearly all—Prussian, Bavarian, Saxon, Austrian, etc. And these two subjects are history of classic antiquity and contemporary history. The Greeks and Romans share with the peoples that live around us the first place in the attention of teachers and students. History of the Middle Ages and history of Germany, like geography, are also taught in almost all the universities. Again, while some of the universities have no course in modern history or history of Germany, almost all have one, and frequently several, theoretical courses in the auxiliary sciences that have become indispensable, such as methodical study of sources, critical diplomatics and paleography. In Belgium, all these auxiliaries are as yet unrecognized. Law is completely ignored. Even the history

[1] On the other hand, general history is not taught at all except in some of the southern universities. Specialization has killed it, but without much sorrow on anybody's part.

section of the Normal School at Liége, founded in 1880, incomprehensibly remains without them.

But the most significant feature of our table is that all the universities that speak the German language have practical courses; on an average they have three apiece; some have seven, like Berlin and Leipzig. It is not to be wondered at; these courses are the corner-stone of all history teaching in Germany. To his practical exercises the professor devotes all his skill and zeal and pride; he often treats his theoretical courses with more or less indifference and gives them perfunctorily. Without the literary elegance and spirit of the French professors, the German theoretical courses are often very dull and tiresome, while the practical courses are in the highest degree instructive and generally very lively and interesting; upon them the professor spends all his energy and genius.

The father of practical courses is preëminently the illustrious Leopold von Ranke.[1] About 1830 he began to gather at his house, one evening in the week, certain promising pupils, to initiate them in personal scientific work. The Latin program of the university mentioned these courses as *Exercitationes historicae.* Among Ranke's first pupils were Waitz, von Giesebrecht, Max Duncker, Ad. Schmidt, Heinrich von Sybel, Wattenbach and others who have become princes of the science. Germany has hardly a historian of value who has not worked at least one term under Ranke. The old Prussian minister, Delbrück, the Swedish minister, Carlson, and numerous other statesmen have worked in his celebrated practical courses.

In 1867, at the celebration of the 50th anniversary of Ranke's doctorate, amid the cheers of the hundreds of admirers and pupils gathered in Berlin to honor their master, M. Waitz

---

[1] This sketch of German practical courses is taken from numerous conversations with almost all the professors I have met. I hope there are not many errors, though it is difficult for a foreigner to avoid them entirely.

rendered him this tribute: "You never demanded that the young friends whom you have drawn around you should walk just as you have walked. You have never tried to confine their activity to a single domain, to form a school in the narrow sense of the term, by imposing rules for manner or matter. On the contrary, unlimited liberty in choice of subjects and in manner of conceiving them and of treating them has been a matter of course. You loved to see the different natures of your pupils develop according to their own inclinations. You followed after to guide and check them without hampering their originality."[1] I can add nothing to the eulogy that all Germany endorses.

Before long Ranke's pupils, themselves professors and tutors, will have introduced these practical exercises into other universities. Von Sybel and Waitz have been mentioned above. The latter, after the example of his master, has devoted, since 1850, almost all his skill and energy to this fruitful method, and has raised, in 25 years, a legion of disciples at Göttingen.

At first it was the custom to borrow topics from the history of Germany in the Middle Ages. This period of magnificent struggles of the Holy German Empire attracted and charmed the patriots, who groaned over the humiliating rôle afterward played in Europe by their country. This is, doubtless, the cause of the universal liking for the Middle Ages. M. Droysen, Sr., as I am told, was the first to introduce, systematically, into practical courses the history of modern times.

As a pupil of Boekh, he had first studied antiquity, and his history of Alexander the Great is still much valued. But in 1848, as professor at the University of Kiel, he launched into politics and was sent as deputy to the Parliament of

---

[1] G. Waitz, *Die historischen Uebungen zu Göttingen.—Glückwunschschreiben an Leopold von Ranke zum Tage der Feier seines funfzigjährigen Doctorjubiläums, 20 Februar, 1867*, p. 4.

Frankfort, where he was one of those who upheld the necessity of Prussian hegemony in bringing Germany to political unity. This conviction led him, in 1852, to create at Jena, where he was professor, a course of practical exercises in the scientific study of modern history of Prussia. He called it *Historische Gesellschaft*, and in 1859 he carried the same society to the University of Berlin. His example was then followed in a great many universities and to-day there tends to be an equilibrium established between mediæval and modern history in the practical courses. Besides, there are also some of these courses in classic antiquity and also, though rarely, in Oriental history.

All these practical courses are carried on at the professor's house, generally in his study. They thus, of necessity, bring about intimacy with the professor and, more than any other teaching, are free from rules and official restraint. In 1856 M. von Sybel, the great historian, who was then professor at the University of Munich, solicited the help of the Bavarian government in the support of practical teaching. He secured an annual allowance sufficient to offer to his best pupils prizes of from 50 to 100 marks. This was the beginning of State historical seminaries. Removing in 1861 to the University of Bonn, M. von Sybel succeeded in establishing there a similar institution under the Prussian government. This seminary was placed under the direction of three professors, one of whom, according to the by-laws of the university, was a Roman Catholic. They were, at first, M. von Sybel, M. Loebel and M. Ritter, the last in virtue of his religion. The pupils chose which of the three they would work with.

Lately another step has been taken in this direction, thanks to the energy of M. von Noorden. In the different universities in which he has taught, Greifswald, Tübingen, Bonn and Leipzig, this eminent professor has secured for the history seminary a special apartment and a library of necessary books

in duplicate and triplicate. There is thus furnished to the students a hygienic work-room, warmed and well lighted, a hundred times better than the narrow chambers or miserable garrets where they live; it furnishes them at the same time all the necessary books, many of which are too costly for them to possess and which they would have to wait a long time for at the university libraries, where there is but one copy, and that one continually lent out. Moreover, in these quarters the students are under the immediate direction of the professors, who visit the hall daily and give their counsel.

This important reform has been sharply criticized on the ground that it puts the students too directly under the tutelage of the professors. M. von Noorden told me that Waitz, Droysen, von Sybel and other great authorities disapprove of the system, and added that in the case of the few, future professors at universities and those who will become more than ordinary scholars, they are not wrong; but he remains convinced that his system is excellent for the mass of students who are destined to become professors in schools of lower grade. The University of Strasburg has lately been added to those that have adopted M. von Noorden's common study-hall.[1]

The *Arbeit-Zimmer* will in all probability soon become the rule, if it is not already. At any rate almost all the German universities have given official sanction to the practical courses in history by transforming them into State seminaries. It is only the Universities of Berlin and Göttingen—universities of the first rank in other respects—that hold to the old traditions. The question is a much vexed one among German professors, and in 1867 M. Waitz, who was then teaching at Göttingen with all the prestige of his great scientific reputation, took advantage of the Ranke Jubilee publicly to attack these State seminaries. He regarded the practical courses as encumbrances, baits for the mediocre who have no real aptitude for the work,

[1] At Strasburg, Baumgarten and Weizsäcker made this reform some years ago.

but who are attracted by the hope of pecuniary gain. He believed the time had come for limiting the numbers admitted to these courses, since the number of superficial amateurs was growing year by year. It was time, he thought, that the science should be cultivated for itself alone in a spirit of absolute disinterestedness.

The pecuniary inducements are, in reality, the weak point of State seminaries. I have been assured that poor students often count upon these prizes without the slightest taste for scientific research. They botch up an essay in the hope of getting paid for it from the funds of the seminary. I have heard, too, that the professors sometimes make awards to poor devils out of pure compassion, because the money is there at their disposal and would return unused into the state coffers if not appropriated within the year. On the other hand M. Dümmler asserted that the prizes are hard to get in universities where poor students are many, as at Halle, and that, when carefully awarded by the professors, they do a great deal of good.

However that may be, many of the professors who direct the State seminaries, and believe in them, have completely abolished the pecuniary assistance to students and devote all the annual subsidy to the library. They do not prohibit certain special encouragements, such as a little allowance given to an earnest student to permit him to study documents in some distant locality, etc. As to the principle involved, they believe that an annual stipend from the State is necessary to the complete success of the practical course system.

I cannot pretend to pass judgment for Germany; but it seems to me that in Belgium it would be very difficult to propagate these courses without an annual subsidy and the categoric sanction of the State to their introduction into the framework of higher teaching. Otherwise, dependent only on the caprice of certain good-natured professors, as at the State University at Liége and the Free University at Brussels, where the experiment has been tried of late years, they may

disappear at any moment, greatly to the prejudice of the faculties of arts and philosophy.

There is no other means of improving the higher teaching of history, or rather, of making it scientific teaching. At the present time, for lack of practical courses, our Belgian universities are not producing historians. All the historians of Belgium have made themselves. It is to this fact that we must look for the explanation of the deplorable imperfections in so many of our works, otherwise full of genius and stubborn investigation. What is the real condition of our students? My colleague at Liége, M. Kurth,[1] wrote of them not long ago, after a visit to the German universities, "If there are any among them who have a love for study, deprived as they are of the direction of a master in their first attempts, they will grope for years before they find a good method and oftenest they will stop half way, discouraged. But if, when, glowing with zeal and with all the warmth of young imagination, they are ready to venture upon a noble career, their first attempts are guided by a wise and devoted master who will lead them by the hand through the labyrinth of first difficulties, teach them how, avoiding every détour, to come straight to their end, what methods to follow, what mistakes to shun and from what resources to draw—they will soon learn to guide themselves and even to help the master clear new fields; they will be scholars, or at least be capable of becoming scholars; at any rate they will have a mature and well-equipped understanding."

Almost all foreign specialists who have visited the German universities speak with the same admiration of the practical courses in history. M. Seignobos, however, has recently criticized them severely, holding them responsible for the retardation which he thinks he discovers in the historical advance of Germany. "The young man," he says, "who leaves

---

[1] *De l'enseignement de l'histoire en Allemagne* in the *Revue de l'instruction publ. in Belgium*, vol. XIV, p. 90.

the gymnasium has not one accurate general notion in his head. He has not the slightest suspicion that there are societies, that they have organs and functions, that they are subject to laws. These are the things he ought to learn. He is, instead, thrown at once into the midst of documents to learn in detail where they were found, what was their origin and by what external signs the good are distinguished from the bad. He quickly becomes skilful in these performances. Later he will perhaps be useful in gathering and preparing materials; but will he not be incapable of putting them in shape? And when all receive this kind of training who will build the house?—Providence will take care of that! there will be found among them men who will be architects without ever having studied architecture!—Do not the German scholars perceive that, since historians have been brought up by their method, there has been an extraordinary dearth of great comprehensive works, and that those that have been written are commonly the works of savants of the old school?

"In introducing this method into their seminaries the professors of the preceding generation fell into a very natural error. They had, for the most part, in their youth studied law, theology and literature. They had all received, from the philosophy then in vogue, general ideas of human nature, the state, rights and duties. Usually they had been interested in politics and had made some effort in the cause of united Germany; some of them had been prisoners. Their temper was reached slowly and unconsciously.

"Then they turned to history and discovered that they lacked certain indispensable technical knowledge—paleography, diplomatics, and critical skill in texts. There was as yet no regular teaching in these departments and they had to teach themselves, alone and doubtless with great difficulty. Finally they began to produce; their genius was ripe and they knew enough of technique; they could put into general form solid facts of detail. This double preparation enabled them to

compose the comprehensive historical works upon which the present generation lives.

"Having become professors, these men forget the general preparation they unconsciously received from experience; they regard their habit of mind as a natural gift. They remember only their technical training, because of the time and trouble that it cost them. They hope to spare their pupils this toil by teaching them early the criticism of texts that they had to acquire late.

"But the judgment of the youths who come into their hands has not been formed as theirs was; the students know nothing of life, of human nature and of societies. At the seminary they are taught only technique. They learn it readily; perhaps they even surpass their masters. But their intellectual growth is stopped. They do not accustom themselves to look underneath details and they never attain the composition of a general work. The sterility of the historians graduated from certain celebrated seminaries is a striking fact. The professors often observe this weakness; they find that the level of genius has lowered since their day. They do not ask themselves whether, after having bent the flexible mind of the young man to work of details without furnishing him the corrective of general ideas, they have any right to be surprised that he has not risen. Can they complain because they see no architects rising from a generation of men bred artisans?"

This charge of M. Seignobos against German practical courses is put in clever and brilliant style; but I think it has little foundation. Undoubtedly history is passing through a crisis in Germany. I have heard it affirmed by eminent men. One professor who fitly wears a title of great renown said to me in 1881: "The crisis is undeniable. The historical skill of Germany is still the first in the world, but it is wasted upon infinitesimal concerns. Ranke is to-day almost alone as the representative of that old tradition which required the historian to be at once an explorer of new sources and a thinker with general views. And Ranke is eighty-

four years old! two months older than our old Emperor William! The young men are making a mistake in persistently cultivating microscopic history!" In fact, a man always falls on the side to which he leans. After having lived exclusively upon metaphysical history, the famous philosophy of history that in principle carried out the tradition of *a priori* generalization which the eighteenth century bequeathed us, we have, with reactionary eagerness, repudiated all general views as premature and have set ourselves to scrutinizing matters of history with a microscope. There has been too much of it; the clearsighted genius of Germany is awake to it and I have heard many a cry of alarm. But of either extreme I prefer the one that bases history upon a criticism so searching that it even sometimes degenerates into cumbersome details. Let us be content; those materials, heaped up and made ready for use by the dogged workers of the history seminaries, will in the fulness of time find the great architects who want them. They will find them more surely, I am convinced, than *a priori* architects would otherwise find preconceived notions out of which to build their houses of cards for a breath to blow down. M. Seignobos himself finishes his remarks with these words: "Even though the study of history in Germany should be destined to become petrified into criticism of texts, we must not ignore the services it has rendered. It has driven rhetoric out of history and has taught us to refer to original documents. France greatly needs to profit by this example, and if we have not spared the German system the criticisms that it seemed to us to merit, we know too well what our own system lacks not to recognize, when all is said, that there is still much reason for us to envy Germany."

For my part I do not fear the future petrifaction of German historical science. I have found it too active, too varied and too open to all progress to believe that a passing crisis, born of an exaggerated good, can be its death throe. I have, moreover, met too many masters and students with large ideas to

believe that the evil is as widespread as is asserted.[1] And finally, still more than France, Belgium needs to profit by the example of Germany. It can be said, without lack of patriotism, that in the study of history not *many* but *all* the Belgian universities have reason to envy German universities; for we have not even, to reflect us consolation, the brilliant varnish of the oratorical courses of France, which M. Seignobos so well calls the rhetoric of history.

[1] France does Germany justice in this regard, as is evident from the remarkable article recently published by M. Ernest Lavisse in the *Revue des deux Mondes*, 15th Feb., 1882 (*L'enseignement historique en Sorbonne et l'éducation nationale*).

HISTORY AT PARIS.

No one of the great German universities can boast so many historical courses as are to be found scattered through the various institutions for advanced study at Paris: at the Faculty of Arts, the College of France, the School of Charters, the Higher Normal School, the Practical School of Higher Studies and the Free School of Political Science. In the summer term of 1881, during my visit to the German universities, Berlin had twenty-six historical courses, Leipzig twenty-one, Breslau sixteen, Bonn fourteen, Göttingen fourteen and the other universities accordingly.[1] At Paris a full count would show without difficulty fifty courses in history and its auxiliary sciences.

It is evident that to attend the lectures of all the masters in the various quarters, between eight in the morning and seven at night, is no small task. After having devoted to it a month's careful investigation, I cannot attempt to present more than a sketch of the study of history in Paris. I am constrained, moreover, to repeat my statement of last year in my paper upon German universities: the following pages are simply observations. They do not pretend to solve the numerous questions that concern the organization of theoretical and

[1] See the full table of the number of history courses at the German universities in the summer term of 1881, as given on p. 38 of my report upon history at the universities of Berlin, Halle, Leipzig and Göttingen (*Revue de l'Instruction publique en Belgique* for 1882).

practical courses of history; they offer only my impressions and recollections, presented as faithfully is possible.

I. The College of France.

I begin with the College of France, because in it, tracing as it does its origin to Francis I,[1] may best be recognized the long-descended features of French higher education.

It is well known that the course of instruction in this institution to-day consists of public lectures, given with illustrations, in every science. All day long men and women of all ages, among them in summer numerous tourists, come and go in the quiet little courts leading to the halls marked for entrance and exit, like a church.

Some of the halls are small dungeons where the sufferer stifles; others,[2] so vast that the speaker can but suggest the *vox clamantis in deserto*. M. Deschanel, expounding vivaciously a fable of La Fontaine, drew so large a crowd that the folding doors at the entrance to the hall were left open to permit belated devotees who thronged the corridors to catch the laughter and murmured applause of the more fortunate listeners within. The public, composed in great part of ladies, revelled in the professor's lively and occasionally coarse wit. M. Gaston Boissier, who lectured with exquisite delicacy upon Horace, likewise had in attendance the day I was there a great many ladies and also a number of priests.

Other professors, who keep strictly to specialties, teach in little halls, seated at the head of a table, around which their

---

[1] The *Statistique de l'Enseignement supérieur*, 1865–1868, gives pp. 541–555, an interesting historical notice of the College of France.

[2] M. Gabriel Monod (*De la possibilité d'une réforme de l'Enseignment supérieur*, p. 26) tells the following incident: "Michelet relates somewhere how some peasants returning from market entered the College of France and went into the hall where M. E. Quinet was lecturing, believing it to be a church. A strange kind of teaching where all the passers-by may step in and where the lectures are indistinguishable from sermons!"

auditors are ranged. It was thus I heard M. Renan explain and discuss certain Semitic inscriptions. Ensconced in an arm-chair, which his corporosity well filled, he chatted with freedom and good nature; his assistant, M. Berger, drew facsimiles on the blackboard at the professor's direction. Ten serious students took notes at the table. Along the wall were seated some chance hearers, two of whom were ladies and two seminarists. From time to time a stray old gentleman or an English tourist found his way into the hall and made himself at home, soon departing without ado. In the same little room I heard a lecture on the grammar of the *Langue d'oïl*, by M. Gaston Paris. Out of the seventeen listeners, of whom one was a woman, twelve took notes with exemplary activity. M. Paris was speaking of the *o* open and the *o* close before a simple nasal in the romance dialects, and every time the door opened to admit a stroller he darted at the offender a withering ray from his single eye-glass.

The lectures in the smaller rooms are much more scientific and fruitful than those in the large halls; the latter seem to be intended only for the floating mass of idlers.

During the summer of 1881 the historical course was as follows: M. Ed. Laboulaye treated the political theories of the eighteenth century; M. Alfred Maury the history of England, from the sixteenth to the eighteenth century, as well as the migrations of the ancient nations that established themselves in Europe; M. Ernest Desjardins gave a course on the epigraphy of Roman Gaul; M. Olivier Rayet described the private life of the Greeks, especially the Athenians; and M. Albert Réville related the religious history of the Chinese.

I did not hear M. Laboulaye, as he had suspended his lectures on account of illness, nor M. Rayet; fortunately I met the latter at the Practical School of Higher Studies.

I attended M. A. Maury's lecture upon the migrations of ancient peoples. In a vast columned hall, which it would take hundreds to fill, ten women and about twenty men, of various descriptions, scattered here and there, leaned against

the pillars or reclined in the embrasures of the windows. No one took notes. M. Maury spoke of prehistoric times and of the admirable works of the Danish scholar Worsaae. With engaging good nature, and without a moment's delay, the professor lectured into space, as if wholly resigned.

M. Réville had many more listeners to his course on the religion of the Chinese. He was engaged with the struggles of the Popes against the Jesuits established in China in the last century. I thought I recognized entire the interesting articles, *Variétés*, which M. Réville contributed in 1882 to the *Flandre libérale*, a Belgian periodical, published at Ghent. There were a great many ladies present, part of whom formed the professor's escort at his departure.

In another great lecture-room I heard M. Desjardins give a most interesting discourse upon the Roman province, before a score of people, chiefly idlers. Of the four ladies two napped gracefully in a retired corner.

I will not stay longer at the College of France. It is very little frequented by true students;[1] save the lectures given to the select few in the small rooms, its teaching cannot train pupils. Of the public lectures persons of small means, chance stragglers and tourists form the ever-changing audience. I sincerely pity the famous masters subjected to such a system, but as fast as advanced methods are instituted at the Faculty of Arts true students begin to frequent the College of France.

II. The School of Charters.

The College of France is situated beside the Sorbonne in the district of the schools, on the east side of the celebrated

[1] M. Monod says on this subject: "I have proved this indifference of younger students by a striking instance. I watched for one year a course in legal history given at the College of France by an eminent savant. I thought that out of the 3,000 law students at least a hundred would take care to improve this rare chance of completing their studies. But I was mistaken. There were but sixty listeners and among them at most but ten young men, four of whom took notes. The rest of the audience consisted of ten ladies, ten men of mature age and thirty old men.

hill of St. Genevieve. The School of Charters is in a totally different quarter of Paris, on the other bank of the Seine, in the midst of the *Marais, rue des Francs-Bourgeois*, 58, occupying part of the building of the national record office. Its history deserves to be briefly related.

Under the first empire the question of establishing a special school of history was vaguely agitated.[1] But it was after the Restoration, by a royal ordinance of 22d February, 1821, that the School of Charters was founded, beginning with two professors and six pupils, but without suitable quarters, one of the courses being given at the Royal Library, the other at the *Archives du royaume*. This precarious existence was laboriously sustained until 1847. An ordinance of 31st December, 1846, provided for the school a building, a director and assistant director, two titular professors, three readers and a secretary-treasurer. The director was the Hellenist Letronne. Although following a specialty foreign to the work of the School of Charters, Letronne exerted a marked and fruitful influence. It was he who founded its library, its fine collections, its present course of study, all that gave it vigor and fame. The late director, Jules Quicherat, well recorded this fact over the tomb of Letronne. Quicherat himself lived to render eminent service to the school.[2]

---

[1] In the notes dictated at Chateau de Finckenstein 19th April, 1807, consequent upon propositions made by M. de Champagny, minister of the interior, Napoleon recognized the possibility and utility of a special school of history. These are significant lines: "History and legislation should be placed in the first rank; the professor should go back to the Romans and come from there down, surveying the various ages of the French kings down to the code of Napoleon. The second place should be held by the history of military art. Of what interest it would be, for example, to know the means employed at various epochs for the attack and defence of places in our territory, etc." The same notions guided Napoleon when M. de Champagny proposed to him to create a chair of national history at the College of France. He then wrote in his own hand on the margin hints of new chairs to be founded: "1st. Military history of France; 2d. History of legislation in France."

[2] See the papers by M. A. Giry devoted to Quicherat in the *Revue historique* for July and August, 1882.

The present course of study is of three years' duration and includes: paleography; the romance tongues; bibliography and the arrangement of libraries and records; diplomacy; history of the political, administrative and judiciary institutions of France; civil and canonical law of the Middle Ages and archæology of the same period.[1] The lectures are public, but, in order to receive the title of pupil and its attendant advantages, a man must be admitted by examination. Applicants must be at least twenty-five years old and recommended by a bachelor's diploma. I am told that such a candidate, of average ability, generally takes the examination without special preparation. The subjects of examination are chiefly Latin and general notions of history and geography. Familiarity with a foreign language, English, German, Italian, Spanish, is optional; but, as the candidates are numerous, without the modern languages failure is almost certain. Not more than twenty pupils can be admitted annually. The pupils are subject to two examinations yearly, one at Easter, the other at the close of the session; these examinations are both oral and written, upon the reading and interpretation of manuscripts, as well as upon the matter of the lectures. At the end of the third year the pupils whose merit has been established by the two regular examinations are entitled to write a thesis, of which the outline at least must be printed.[2]

---

[1] A new course for criticism of sources of French history from Gregory of Tours to Philip of Comines was this year (1882–1883) put in the hands of Simeon Luce.

[2] See, for example, the *Positions des thèses soutenues par les élèves de la promotion* 1883, *pour obtenir le diplôme d'archiviste paléographe.* (Paris, Plon et Cie.) The list of theses is as follows: Study on the cartulary of Gellone, 804–1211 (P. Alaus); Essay on the historical geography of Auvergne in the 13th century (J. Argeliès); History of the duchy of Athens and the barony of Argos (R. Bisson de St. Marie); the ancient common law of Paris from the end of the 13th to the first years of the 15th century (H. Buche); Researches concerning Antoine de Lorraine, count de Vaudemont, 1395–1457, his life, his family, his property (A. Cicile); Essay on the life of Clement IV, French pope, 1180–1268 (A. Corda); Essay on the Temple de Paris (H. de Curzon); the Counsel at the Parliament of Paris, 1300–1600

In the first years of its existence the School of Charters produced such remarkable scholars as Quicherat, Lalanne, Bourquelot, Himly, etc., but along with them too many genealogists. Next, under the second empire chiefly, the clerical party made the school their historical stronghold, the Middle Ages and their records being called upon to furnish reactionary arguments. To-day the School of Charters is pervaded by an absolutely disinterested scientific atmosphere. Notwithstanding this fact its disciples are divided into two well-entrenched camps. The papists form a strong phalanx, headed by their eminent professor, M. Léon Gautier. In January of each year the students have a banquet; but according as the majority is liberal or clerical, the dissenting minority often refrains from attendance. I have noted these details, but I have not exaggerated their importance. The students appeared to me to act in harmony, and their political differences are adequately explained by the state of mind of all France. The works of the professors, the pupils and quondam pupils, crowded into the excellent library of the School of Charters, possess scientific loyalty and strict method highly appreciated by the learned world.

(R. Delachenal); Religious Architecture of the country of the Vosges, 1009–1250 (G. Durand); Study on the communal charters of Auvergne (L. Farges); the Châtelet of Paris under the administration of Jean de Foleville, mayor of Paris in the reign of Charles VI, 1389–1401 (G. H. Gaillard); the *Coronement Looys*, song of the 12th century (E. Langlois); Jean de Villiers, Lord of Isle-Adam, Marshal of France, 1384–1437 (G. Lefévre Pontalis); Count Eudes II of Blois, 1004–1037, 1019–1037, and Thibaud his brother, 995–1004 (L. Sex); Admiral Chabot, Lord of Brion, 1492–1542 (A. Martineau); Historical and diplomatic introduction to the catalogue of Acts of Matthew II, duke of Lorraine, 1220–1251 (L. Le Mercier de Morière); Origins of Fief in Franche-Comté and its organization in the 13th century (J. de Sainte-Agathe); Essay on the French government of Genoa in the reign of Charles VI, 1396–1411 (E. Salone.) These theses were submitted 29th January and the days following.

For further details see the *Livret de l'Ecole des Chartes*, published by the Society of the School of Charters (Paris, A. Picard, 1879). It contains a historical notice, information about the actual state of the school, list of all the pupils since 1821 and numerous illustrations.

The lectures are given in a large, not too well lighted hall. Immediately in front of the lecturer's desk is an enclosure marked off for the pupils by a rather high screen, having in the centre a large oval table. Outside this circle the public take their places at small tables in the full light of the windows, while the students, especially in a cloudy day, are plunged in obscurity behind their barricade. Framed under glass, an enormous charter, fringed with numerous seals, hangs on the wall. It is hung too high to admit reading; but it is a Cologne charter of the fourteenth century and the seals are those of the trade-guilds of that town.

Through large glazed casings are visible the shelves of the library and its high windows before which bend the branches of the garden's noble trees. But this fresh corner is not enough to brighten the dull lecture hall.

The pupils, who for the most part take also the course of the *Faculté des lettres* and *L'Ecole pratique des hautes études*, assemble by twos and threes in the lecture-room. Before the beginning of the lecture they chat, laugh and jest together, somewhat like collegians. An officer, with an attendance-book, goes his rounds to take the signatures, and then submits his book to the professor. The lecture lasts an hour and a half—quite long enough; but there are never more than three days in the week required, or more than two lectures in the same day.

The director who succeeds Jules Quicherat, M. Paul Meyer, has charge of the course in romance dialects. He is a man of fine presence and of stern and distinguished bearing. He delivers his lecture in half voice, but the lightest whisper could be heard. The lecture I attended had for its subject the most ancient known fragments of the romance tongues. After a very interesting introduction, M. Meyer distributed numerous fac-similes of the famous oaths of Strasburg, made the pupils decipher them, and commented upon them with the learning and authority that distinguish him. He discussed the conjectures already made and presented a new one. He

examined also the styles of the writing. The whole lecture was pervaded with an elegant dignity but with a cool indifference, quite English. M. Meyer was roused to animation only while demolishing the abominable comments of Chevalet in his *Historie de la formation de la langue française.*

M. Léon Gautier had just preceded M. Meyer with his lecture on paleography. Two men could scarcely present a greater contrast. With his picturesque head, hair and beard disordered, rubicund nose, kind and merry eyes, with his perpetual gesture and sonorous voice, with humor and fancy sometimes trifling, M. Gautier captivates the listener at his first word. The lesson I attended was in reading charters at sight. The method is his own and seemed to me excellent. He gives almost no theoretical teaching; the year through there is nothing but reading at sight, totally separating theory from practical work. I am told that surprising results have followed this method, into which he infuses an irresistible inspiration. Fac-similes are distributed and devoured, one after another, at a racing pace. The bewildered pupils are kept on the alert by the exclamations, objurgations, jests and piquant remarks which M. Gautier lavishes in the most familiar style. "What are you giving me there?—Well read!—Bravo!—That's right!—To be sure!—What is that letter which surpasses all the others as Calypso did the other nymphs?—Courage!—Come!—Come!" etc. And M. Gautier snapped the fingers of both hands, gesticulated and cried out as if to rouse and encourage a team started at full speed, urging, scolding, goading the pupil who reads, apostrophizing the others, drawing all the class into a giddy whirl of amusing paleography.

M. Adolphe Tardif teaches civil and canonical law of the Middle Ages with calm and somewhat monotonous serenity. He is a gray-headed man, of portly figure, wearing a heavy moustache. He has a serious air and a thoughtful face. I heard him give two valuable lectures upon wills and contracts. At each lecture he dictated a set of questions that might be

expected at the examination in those subjects. His style was methodical, clear and interesting, but a trifle heavy. He referred to no special books or monographs, though he noticed and criticized one treatise without giving its name or the name of the author. He stated that within three years seven books upon mediæval French contracts had appeared, five in Germany and two in France; but again he abstained from giving names. This dogmatic style rendered his clear and sound instructions somewhat spiritless.

I attended two of M. de Montaiglon's lectures on bibliography and the classification of public libraries and documents. They were familiar talks, delivered with a smiling countenance, eyes twinkling with benevolence and a modest good humor that recalled Professor W. Wattenbach of Berlin. M. de Montaiglon stated the principles that ought to govern the arrangement of a library, giving a brief history of the libraries at Troyes, Paris and the British Museum and distinguishing theoretical rules from the results of experience. His precepts were mingled with anecdotes and curious details, interesting remarks and digressions. In his course upon national records I heard him give the history of the administrative measures taken since the eighteenth century in France for the preservation of public depositories; he drew therefrom the principles upon which good cataloguing is based. He especially insisted upon the unexplored wealth of French chronicles, particularly in the South, where the deplorable indifference has been broken through most often, he said, by investigators from the North. M. de Montaiglon gave a multitude of accurate details concerning many municipal records. His learning was prodigiously impressive, although dissembled under his almost paternal simplicity. He spoke with much interest of the records of provincial scribes, citing the case of that scribe of Amboise who is believed to have possessed among his papers the will of Leonardo da Vinci, but refused to permit investigation. This desultory course conveyed many valuable suggestions. The greatest familiarity existed between

the pupils and the master, who loved to receive his young associates at home and gladly directed their reading by such counsel as only a living encyclopædia like him could presume to give. No student at the School of Charters failed to appeal for advice in writing his thesis to the wisdom and good nature of M. de Montaiglon. This enviable prerogative he shares with his sympathetic colleague, Léon Gautier.

M. de Mas Latrie teaches diplomatics. I heard him upon diplomas, sealed letters, letters patent, seals, monograms, etc. The lesson was concluded by reading fac-similes of charters of the eleventh century, the difficulties of which rendered the reading somewhat slow. It seemed to me M. de Mas Latrie carried an air of weariness which was reflected from his audience. He is a distinguished scholar and the author of some remarkable works; but his course in diplomatics at the School of Charters holds no very important rank among his interests.

M. Roy has charge of the history of French political, administrative and judiciary institutions. I heard his lecture upon the taille and the exorbitance of taxes under the old regime. The details concerning the States General of 1484, the exactions of the son of Henry II, Colbert's attempts at reform and the financial scheme of Vauban, were very well arranged. The lecture was instructive, sound and methodical.

M. de Lasteyrie succeeded Quicherat in mediæval archæology. M. Roy and he, both former pupils of the School of Charters, are its youngest professors and do it great honor. In the two lectures I attended M. de Lasteyrie was occupied with feudal military dress. He referred to a great many works and drew in chalk upon a huge blackboard warriors of the Middle Ages after the tapestry of Bayeux, the prints published by M. Demay, the books of Viollet-le-Duc, etc. One of the two lectures was devoted to the history of the feudal helmet and the iron head-gear of inferior warriors from the eleventh century to Francis I and Henry III. M. de Lasteyrie is a very engaging teacher, though he speaks with extreme simplicity,

neither raising his voice nor hastening his delivery. A special charm is added to his lecture by the elegance and precision with which he sketches each object of which he speaks. At the close of the lecture he reminded his pupils that he expected to meet them all the next morning at seven o'clock at the Orleans station to conduct them on an archæological expedition to Étampes. It is easy to see the advantage of such excursions under the guidance of a young, agreeable and thoroughly competent master.

The School of Charters seemed to me an institution without equal. Together with the Practical School for Advanced Study it furnishes the most solid, complete and truly scientific historical instruction to be found in Paris.[1] The stranger may well envy France its School of Charters, already ancient; Germany, so well equipped in its universities for history and its accompaniments, has yet, to my knowledge, nothing parallel. Of late years Austria has founded an institution copied from the School of Charters, calling to its head Dr. Theodore Sickel, a free listener at the latter school.

III. The Higher Normal School.

The Higher Normal School is still more ancient than the School of Charters.[2] After the expulsion of the Jesuits, as early as 1761, France was roused to the necessity of establishing "a school for teachers;" but the project did not take shape. In 1795 the Convention laid out some normal courses; but it was the Empire that founded the Normal School in 1808, and the Restoration at first maintained it. Among its pupils at

[1] The annual income of the School of Charters amounted in 1881–1882 to 59,300 francs. The minister frequently increases the allowance to meet extra expenses or to facilitate the archæological excursions of the pupils, not to mention gifts of books which average about 2,000 francs in value each year.

[2] The *Statistique de l'Enseignement supérieur* for 1865–1868 contains (pp. 481–498) an interesting history of the Higher Normal School, of which I will give a short sketch.

that period were Victor Cousin and Augustin Thierry. In 1822 the Normal School was abolished by royal order and replaced by "sectional normal schools" at Paris and elsewhere, established only to excuse the suppression of the original school and immediately left to die. But as soon as 1826 the need of the abandoned school was recognized and it was re-established under the name of the Preparatory School with a two years' course of study. Pupils were admitted "after a preliminary examination in their religious principles, their morals and their scholarship." Furthermore, the provosts of the Academy had to procure references in regard to the pupil's means and "the political and religious standing of his parents."

On the 6th of August, 1830, a decree of Louis Philippe, then lieutenant-general of the realm, gave to the Normal School its present name. Victor Cousin extended the course of study to three years and introduced a new and more generous rule whereby the school was enabled to become the foster-parent of eminent writers and professors. The republic of 1848 effected some trivial changes and took care to appoint a military uniform, with tunic and sword, which fortunately was worn but a year. The second empire proved at first hostile to the school; and, like the Restoration, devoted itself to the religious principles of the pupils. It was then that M. Fortoul, minister of public instruction, erected the chapel which is still standing. With 1857 came a reaction, and today the most liberal spirit pervades the management. M. Fustel de Coulanges has succeeded the lamented Bersot as director.

The quarters assigned to the school were for a long time very unsatisfactory. Beginning with 1826 it was located in the ancient college of Plessis, which an official document does not hesitate to call "those aged structures, propped up on all sides and threatening to fall, damp, unwholesome, inconvenient and insufficient." The ministers Guizot, Cousin and Villemain succeeded, after long delays, in obtaining the handsome buildings the school has occupied since 1847.

These extensive buildings, in the *Rue d'Ulm, 45*, near the Pantheon, are surrounded by well-shaded gardens. The great interior square, with its fountains in the centre, its stone seats, its walks of fine gravel, its fresh shade and white marble busts, all invite to study and meditation. The corridors on the ground floor, well supplied with casts of ancient bas-reliefs, resemble cloisters, lighted from the central court, and leading to the chapel where burns a solitary lamp. There is talk of converting the chapel into a laboratory.

The other rooms are not equal to the foregoing in beauty and impressiveness. They are poorly ventilated and poorly lighted. The walls are bare and of gloomy tints. The great low tables and benches of massive oak, arranged squarely along the walls, worn and scratched with hard use, are heavy and cumbrous. The pupils who sit between the windows cannot see; others have the light in their eyes, and nearly all have to climb over their tables to find their seats. The effect is not entirely pleasing. Through the windows, however, is visible the green of the noble trees, and just outside the door are the cheerful corridors with their classic decorations.

The pupils are subject to restrictions of excessive severity.[1] Aside from attendance upon the lectures at the Faculty of Arts, the College of France and the Practical School, they can leave their quarters only on Sunday, from eight in the morning till ten or half after in the evening, according to the season, and on Thursday, from noon till ten in the evening. Only once a month are they allowed even a moment's grace. Nevertheless the intercourse of these young scholars, brought together from all parts of France, is an excellent element in their development. Friendships are formed that are lasting

[1] See "Rules for the internal discipline of the School" in the "*Statistique de l'Enseignement supérieur*" for 1868, pp. 700, 702. This document contains certain vexatious and unusual provisions. See also a study called "*L'École normale supérieur de Paris*," by two of my colleagues in the University of Ghent, MM. Motte and Thomas, who visited the school with me. (*Revue de l'instruction publique en Belgique*, Vol. XXIV, 1st and 2d parts, 1883.)

and fruitful for science. It would be well to make the regulations less exacting, but to abolish the *internat* would seem to me a serious mistake. Old pupils, since become historians of great merit, have assured me that, although they suffered much from the severity of the rules, they remembered life within the school with great pleasure and that they worked far better there in the midst of comrades engaged in the same study, than if they had lived alone and homeless in Paris.

The Higher Normal School has a maximum of 135 pupils, unequally divided between sciences and arts. I will notice the latter only.

As at the School of Charters, candidates for admission must show a bachelor's degree. In 1882 there were 181 candidates, of whom but the first twenty-five could be admitted to the full privileges of the school. To the next thirty-five were granted scholarships for preparation for a master's degree, on condition that they follow the course of one of the French Faculties of Arts.

The Normal School has a three years' course. At the end of the first year is given the examination for the degree of M. A.; those who fail, after a second trial in the November following, leave the school. Between the second and third years is an easy pass-examination. At the end of the third year comes the fellowship examination, the flooring of which entitles to an allowance of some hundreds of francs, in the provinces 1,000 francs.

During the first two years no courses outside the school are taken. Formerly the students attended the lectures of the Faculties; but as these courses, then purely oratorical, were of so little value that the students chose rather to walk than to attend them, they were discontinued. Only pupils of the third year take courses at the College of France, the Faculties and the Practical School.

The first two years are alike for all students; they comprise philology, literature, philosophy and history. In the second year, with the master's examination behind him, the student

begins his elective studies and develops his special tendencies. The few who enter the school already possessing their master's diploma can work during the first year free from this all-absorbing anxiety, an inestimable advantage.[1] The third year is divided into four sections from which it is necessary to choose: grammar (or philology), literature, history and philosophy.

At present, history is divided as follows: The first year there is a course in ancient history, with two lectures a week by M. Ernest Desjardins. The second year M. Gabriel Monod likewise devotes two lectures a week to mediæval and modern times and requires the students to attend the review lectures of the third year. The department of history for the third year consists of courses in history and in geography. M. Desjardins gives two lectures a week on ancient history, M. Monod on mediæval and modern history, and M. Vidal de Lablache on geography. As at the School of Charters the lectures are an hour and a half long. Further, the students of the Normal School pursue M. Bouché-Leclerq's course in ancient history and M. Ernest Lavisse's and M. Pigeonneau's mediæval and modern history at the Faculty of Arts, as well as special historical courses by MM. Rayet and Roy at the Practical School. In addition to the required courses, still others may be elected according to the pupil's inclination; consequently the outside courses are very various. In a word, only about three hours a day are required for the course, leaving, as at the School of Charters, great freedom of choice.[2]

Beginning in the second year the history pupils write out serious and somewhat profound work. M. Monod names yearly

---

[1] Five out of the twenty-four had entered with this advantage in 1881–1882.

[2] The program of the history section is as follows: Third year, 1881–1882; *Monday*, at 1.30 o'clock, Ancient History, M. Desjardins; at 3 o'clock, Geography, M. Vidal de Lablache; *Tuesday*, at 8, Mediæval History, and at 9.30, Modern History, M. Monod; at 10.45, Ancient History, M. Bouché-Leclerq, at the Faculty; at 3, Ancient History, M. Desjardins; *Wednesday*, at 3, Geography, M. Vidal de Lablache; *Thursday*, at 9, Studies upon Church and State in France in the 8th century, M. Roy, at the Practical School;

about forty subjects from which they choose, but they are permitted to write upon any other subject at will. The following are some of the subjects recommended in 1881: the policy of Pope Gregory the Great, the policy of Pope John VIII, the capitular of Kiersy-sur-Oise, the relations of the Lombards to the Papacy, the diplomacy of Emperor Henry VII, etc. According to the rules of the school each pupil is obliged to submit to the professor his written historical work; but from pupils who will not devote themselves to history M. Monod insists only upon oral reports, given after serious preparation, of some special subjects; as, for example: customs of the tenth century according to *Chanson de Roland*, customs of the eleventh century according to *Chanson des Loherains*, etc. These students may even deal with the analysis and criticism of a new book. Out of the twenty or twenty-four students who usually reach the second year about fifteen or twenty write their work.

Students of history in the third year continue to follow M. Monod's course with the students of the second year, to whom they lecture. With this third division alone M. Monod studies most deeply the subjects belonging to the fellowship course, of which I shall speak more at length. It is not, however, a hot-house forcing; the students delve into the work under direction of the professors, not content simply to pass the examination. They have also lectures and work in ancient history with M. Desjardins and lectures in geography with M. Vidal de Lablache.

I attended one of M. Desjardin's lectures to the history section. There were four in the class. The professor wrote on the blackboard the genealogy of Constantine the Great,

---

at 10.45, Formation of the Prussian State, M. Lavisse, at the Faculty; *Friday*, at 8, Mediæval History and at 9.30, Modern History, M. Monod; at 5, History of the royal power in France in the Middle Ages, M. Lavisse, at the Faculty; *Saturday*, at 12.45, Latin Epigraphy, M. Rayet at the Practical School; at 5, Studies upon the condition of persons and lands at the beginning of 1789, M. Pigeonneau, at the Faculty.

giving at the same time many biographical and epigraphical details. He had brought a little case of medallions and coins of Constantine, Julian, Valentinian and Theodosius; these he submitted to the students with very interesting comments. He characterized briefly the sources of history for this period and the modern works on Constantine. He mentioned the vexed question of the *Portus Iccius*, endeavored to refute the opinion of the archivist Alph. Wauters of Brussels, who had declared himself for Wissant and related how Mariette, born at Boulogne and possessing a country-seat at Pont-de-Brignes, discovered near by, at Isque, the probable location of the *Portus Iccius*. He then added some general remarks upon the sites of ancient Gallic ports. In connection with the itinerary of Constantine he called attention to the regard for geography shown even in the midst of the most incredible legends, as in the Lives of the Saints, and emphasized the immense interest that would attach to a methodical scrutiny of the geography of Lives of the Saints. M. Desjardins thus again and again engrafted upon the different branches of his subject the most curious digressions. He spoke of a book whose first volume had appeared the day before, *Institutions politiques romaines* by M. Mispoulet, which he ranked above the *Manuel d'antiquités romaines* by M. P. Willems, professor at the Catholic University of Louvain, at the same time paying high tribute to the Belgian professor's work.

The geographical instruction is under the direction of M. Vidal de Lablache. I heard a third-year pupil recite before the professor and class of three upon the basin of the Mississippi. The German chart by Sydow was displayed upon the wall as a guide. The pupil had conscientiously studied his lesson and rehearsed it clearly until he became too much involved in details. When he had finished M. Vidal de Lablache criticised the performance with exquisite tact and himself undertook the recitation, pointing out the pupil's omissions and errors. Another day the lesson began with a pupil's presentation of historical geography according to Ar-

rian's Periplus of the Pontus Euxinus, one of the subjects of the fellowship examination. The class followed in C. Muller's annotated edition. The speaker cited Strabo and other ancient geographers to explain the thirty-seventh and the last chapters of the Periplus. M. Vidal de Lablache interrupted from time to time, to touch up or correct. Then Arrian was put aside and the professor lectured upon Russian Asia. The chart they used was the beautiful German chart of central Asia, edited in Vienna by Dr. Joseph Chavanne. M. Vidal de Lablache interrupted his lecture with a most interesting history of the Russian conquests in Asia, especially in Turkestan. The races, the ancient beds of the Oxus and Jaxartes, the rivalry between Russia and England and the history of discovery in Asia, all formed subjects of curious and concise remarks. M. Vidal de Lablache delivered his lecture with a charming simplicity which served to enhance the authority his words carried.

The most important historical course in the school is M. Monod's. The scholarly manager of the *Revue historique* exercises a marked influence upon the scientific development of the embryo historians, as much by his lectures in theory as by the practical drill that he directs. In his theoretical course, covering two years, M. Monod brings in review before the students of the second and third years, the institutions of ancient France. In 1880–81 he devoted the first semester to the Carlovingian epoch and the kings up to St. Louis; the second semester to institutions of the eighteenth century. In 1881–82 he took up first the Merovingian institutions, afterward those of the sixteenth century. In two of the lectures I attended M. Monod spoke of judicial reforms of the sixteenth century, of the *procureur* or public prosecutor, of the *mercuriales*, of the chancellors and keepers of the seals, of edicts and their registration, of the bench, of the parliaments, of the venality of the judicial offices, of court fees, etc. He constantly referred to special works and to collections of documents, giving many graphic and very accurate details. A

vast amount of scientific labor was disguised beneath extreme simplicity. His teaching was sound, conscientious and attractive, and would have been faultless but for a certain timidity of delivery. Infallible as he is, he is too modest in the statement of his opinions. It is his one fault; but in spite of that I hope some time to see a complete manual of his excellent course on the antiquities of France under the old regime.

Last of all, I heard a third-year pupil recite under M. Monod's direction. His subject was feudal laws in France about the time of the great revolution, and the performance was methodical and elaborate. The pupil frequently cited M. Taine and the documents he has made conspicuous, Arthur Young's Travels, for instance. M. Monod then searchingly criticised the method of the recitation and its historical ideas. His remarks were very clear, just, and simply expressed, forming a wise and instructive commentary on the subject in hand. At the close of the lesson M. Monod assigned subjects for similar work to three other pupils: the village in 1789, the internal organization of towns at that epoch and the position of the nobility at the breaking out of the Revolution. These lectures by the pupils in preparation for the history fellowship examination are pervaded by a liberal and essentially scientific spirit.

IV. The Practical School for Advanced Study.

The Practical School for Advanced Study is the most admirable and fruitful creation of M. Victor Duruy's able ministry.[1] Before his time the Faculties of Arts scarcely deserved to be classed among institutions for advanced study; brilliant and eloquent public lectures were given, not at all for the pupils, but for an ever-changing audience of intelligent

[1] For the reforms and improvements introduced into France by M. Duruy during the six years (1863–1869) of his administration, see *l'Administration de l'instruction publique* (Paris, Delalain, 1870), and *Circulaires et instructions officielles relatives à l'instruction publique* (*Ibid.*).

free-listeners, ladies, and idlers of all sorts. Beyond this the chief function of the professor seemed to be examination. It could be said without exaggeration: "The Faculties are only a jury to examine for bachelor's and master's degrees. The course is scarcely six months long, since four months are devoted to examinations. At a pinch the administration permits a professor to omit his lectures provided only he is punctual at the examinations."[1]

The situation is such that M. Duruy in a report on advanced instruction, submitted with the greatest publicity to Napoleon III in 1868, did not hesitate to say: "While the Faculties that prepare directly for certain professions like the law and medicine find on all sides vast numbers of disciples, the Faculties of arts and sciences are in more than one place languishing, and nowhere assemble a community of serious students. The listeners are of all ages and conditions, attracted by the professor's eloquence, but in no way subject to that continuous contact with him which alone constitutes effective teaching. We have no fear that our professors will lose the peculiarly French tradition of polished, clever and even eloquent discourse; but they will unite with it, as many already do, didactic discourse.[2] For the end of advanced teaching is not merely to rouse a love for study: it aims, above all things, to impart to the hearer methods of study and the science which those methods have created. In Germany such men as Boeckh, Ritschl, Welcker, Ranke and Raumer gave, or give, to their lectures from eight to ten or twelve hours a week; but the lectures do not demand such preparations as our professors make. They are, rather, minute directions, carefully noted down by the students and used for reference. Thanks to the habits of study thus formed, Germany can always furnish for every branch of human knowledge several distinguished masters, each one surrounded by numerous disciples. France

[1] G. Monod, work cited, Note 2, p. 44.

[2] This assertion was perhaps a little too optimistic in 1868.

possesses, beside the eloquent professors who draw their daily hundreds of auditors, noted scholars whose worthy followers are as few as their competent critics; it is such chairs that sooner or later stand empty."[1] That these statements were made by the minister to the emperor gives them emphasis enough.

At the same time there were in certain Faculties some rare professors who took pleasure in surrounding themselves with pupils and in privately directing their work in "minor lectures," so called to distinguish them from formal public lectures.

The vice-provost of the Academy of Paris, M. Gréard, referred to the subject recently, betraying how vague the conception still remains: "St. Mark Girardin, who first introduced at the Sorbonne the minor lecture in addition to the regular, said: 'Between the two I see but one difference; in the former, devoted to the reading of text, I work under the eyes of my pupils and teach them how to work; in the latter I bring them the work already done.'"[2]

Among the veterans of the *Facultés des Arts* at Paris, the pioneers of the advance, M. Egger deserves special mention. He has always made his hearers pupils, directing them and even giving extra lessons. I have been told, too, that Michelet, while professor at the Normal School and at the College of France, surrounded himself with optional students. But these were isolated attempts, and oratorical lectures constitute almost the only teaching of the *Facultés*.

M. Duruy, grasping the extent of the evil, had resolved to remedy it by substituting regular students in place of a floating audience and by creating libraries and laboratories. But, beforehand, he instituted in 1865 and 1866 a general inquiry into foreign methods of teaching. French ambassadors, ministers plenipotentiary and consuls received a list of questions to

---

[1] *Administration de l'instruction publique* (1863–1869), pp. 717–719.

[2] Gréard, *l'Enseignement supérieur à Paris*, 1881, p. 43.

be answered. Soon their reports poured into Paris, and among them were some very remarkable ones. The vice-consul of France at Koenigsberg, M. Dahse, sent an admirable paper upon the university of that town. M. Karl Hillebrand, then professor at the University of Douai, was sent to Germany, Holland and Belgium;[1] MM. Demogeot and Montucci to England. Their reports also were most interesting and useful.

All this preliminary work was in preparation for the reform; but the greatest difficulty was met in the Faculties themselves, almost all the professors being strict partisans of the existing methods. M. Duruy then decided to avoid the obstacle by leaving the *Facultés des Paris* as they were and establishing the Practical School in opposition to them. He is credited at this juncture with the keen observation: "The Faculties are an old wall which I have not power to overthrow; but in its fissures I will plant the new school and I expect the roots of the young plant will creep into the cracks and finally ruin the old wall."

By an order of 31st July, 1868, the Practical School for Advanced Study was established.

In his reports to the emperor, previous to the order, M. Duruy did not hesitate to insist again upon the insufficiency of the instruction given by the Faculties, somewhat softening his criticisms: "It would be useless," said he, "to deny that in arts our advanced teaching promises more than it performs, through the fault not of the professors but of our methods. The masters have to address a public which may change with every lecture and which, coming to listen for an hour to a well-turned speech, would be disgusted by dry didactics. They are then bound to put their lectures into well-studied form. The time devoted to such work is far from being lost, and these graceful, clever and often eloquent lectures,

[1] See K. Hillebrand, *De la réforme de l'Enseignement supérieur*, Paris, 1868.

sometimes garnished with applause (with which I could gladly dispense), tend to raise the level of public intelligence and, at a time when literary improvisation rules, they happily maintain the demand for hard and patient study. This alone is an invaluable service to the country. Let our *Facultés des lettres* continue to attract its crowds of listeners, but give it also the means of securing and forming true students. Instruction addressed to the latter will take a new character; the student will not, like the occasional listener, demand that he be moved or amused, but that he be taught. The professor can go to him without laboriously compiling his lecture according to the rules of art; it is enough that he carry his knowledge and find out how to communicate it in familiar and fruitful intercourse. As soon as our professors shall, like those of German universities, have true disciples, though they keep the precious qualities of our national genius and preserve the art of speaking well, inseparable as it is from the art of thinking well, they will devote more time to the cultivation of literary and historical learning so high in honor beyond the Rhine, now of too little account with us."[1]

To attain this end M. Duruy had already instituted, a little time before, in some colleges in the country, "didactic exercises," under the name of Secondary Normal Schools, whose courses were to open in October, 1868;[2] but at Paris, in spite of the Faculties, he deemed it necessary to found an entirely independent organization—the Practical School for Advanced Study. He justified this action to the emperor as follows:

---

[1] *L'Administration de l'instruction publique* (1853–1869), pp. 646, 647.

[2] In a circular of 25th March, 1868, M. Duruy says: "The professors of the Faculties have lectures to give at the Secondary Normal Schools. They will find there a worthy audience; not a floating audience that listens to lectures by the way, but earnest students, capable of doing credit to the zeal and ability of their masters." At Paris, also, M. Duruy organized some free courses, more scientific than those of the Faculties, the lectures being given in Gerson Hall and attended almost exclusively by students. Among the young men of talent to whom M. Duruy entrusted the delicate task of assailing thus the traditions of oratorical lectures were MM. Gaston Paris, Rambaud and Léger. These lectures in Gerson Hall fell with the Empire.

"The young man who feels within him the hidden flame that will perhaps burst forth into genius; the man who has completed the usual courses of study or who finds them distasteful; the man who cherishes no hope of a lucrative career or who, from an already secured position, is irresistibly drawn toward pure science; such an one cannot find in all our scientific establishments the necessary means for advancing quickly and surely in the way his genius leads.

"At the College of France, at the Museum, at the Sorbonne, at the Medical School, he finds eminent masters to whom he may listen; in our public libraries, books upon which to ponder; in our collections, objects to study. But too often he is deprived of precise direction, of special counsel, of encouragement; what his books or his masters teach he cannot verify or enrich for himself by observation and experience. Then he perceives that the scholar is formed, not alone before the professor's chair where the public may sit, but in the laboratories which are now closed upon him, in the midst of those books, manuscripts and collections where he must learn to seek and find the hidden truth. Among the attendants upon the lectures, looking at science only from afar, there are, without doubt, some whose energy increases in this very isolation and who, by force of will, learn to procure everything with nothing; but the number of such is small. How many stop discouraged by difficulties, and even by those who succeed, how much time and effort is lost! Keen and devoted masters sometimes discover these persistent geniuses and encourage them. Such encouragement is a secondary end of the proposed decree, to be gained by establishing, near our existing universities, special schools whose union will form *L'École pratique des hautes études.*

"This school will be divided into four sections: mathematics, physics and chemistry, natural history and physiology, history and philology."[1]

---

[1] *Circulaires*, etc., pp. 652, 653, 654.

Speaking further of this fourth section, M. Duruy well said: "For philology our schools teach only the classics; for history only general ancient, mediæval and modern history. The College of France, faithful to its origin, has chairs for the different branches of historical learning, but there again is found an audience and not students.

"The curriculum of this section indicates various works on archæology, linguistics, epigraphy, paleography, comparative philology, general grammar, historical criticism, etc., which are to be taken up under the direction of skilful masters, capable of forming rivals and successors to themselves."[1]

M. Duruy foresaw that the success of his bold attempt at reform depended chiefly upon the men chosen to carry it out; he therefore appointed as directors and lecturers men who were absolutely independent of all university tradition. The directors were M. Léon Renier, librarian at the Sorbonne, who was placed at the head of the school, with the title of president—"a happy choice;"[2] Mr. William Waddington, of Oxford, an amateur Hellenist, who has since become superintendent of public instruction; M. Michel Bréal, who had brought from Germany unyielding notions which seemed monstrous to the old universities; and M. Alfred Maury, director of the national records, for historical sciences.

To the amazement of all M. Duruy had chosen for his faculty young men of no reputation, in whom he had with remarkable sagacity discovered ability and originality. They were truly a company of independent spirits, some of whom would never be expected to fill official positions. One was the son of a legitimist who had refused to give lessons to an empress; another had, on graduating from the normal school, renounced teaching because he was unwilling to take the oath to the empire; a third had come from a theological seminary; a fourth was a Sanskritist almost entirely self-educated; a fifth

[1] *Circulaires*, etc., p. 655.

[2] Preface to *Mélanges*, published by the history and philology section of the Practical School in 1878, at their tenth anniversary.

had been brought up by a disciple of Jacotot and had never been inside a college or university. The others were as remarkable. Let me add that all these young lecturers had to content themselves with nominal salaries, since the reforming superintendent lacked funds.

M. Alfred Maury was director of history; and M. Gabriel Monod, who had returned from Germany where he had worked one semester at Berlin under the direction of Koepke and another at Göttingen under Waitz, was chosen as lecturer in history. In December, 1868, since the history and philology section had as yet no rooms, M. Maury assembled at his house the professors and their prospective pupils; professors and pupils were of nearly the same age. At this meeting it was decided to organize practical work in history. The lectures were to be given at first in M. Monod's modest study in the *Rue de Vaugirard*. Some time afterward M. Léon Renier obtained for the school a couple of small rooms in the library building of the Sorbonne.

Such was the modest beginning of the school which has done so much to reform scientific thinking and teaching in France. The first year the philology and history section of the school contained only a handful of students scattered through eight courses. To-day there are twenty-five professors giving more than fifty courses with a proportionate number of students, among whom there is every year a large contingent of foreigners, proving the reputation the school has already gained outside of France. Among the specialists whom the school has produced in history alone there stand in the first rank the lamented Charles Graux, MM. Longnon and Hanotaux, now lecturers, MM. Mispoulet, Thédenat, etc., not to mention MM. Giry, Roy, de Lasteyrie and several other pupils of the School of Charters, who have been greatly influenced by the Practical School.

Since its institution, the history and philology section has been located on the fourth floor of the right wing of the Sorbonne in the small rooms of the university library. The

rooms are low, almost garrets, opening together by means of glazed doors, their walls lined with books from the floor to the ceiling; they are true laboratories for a philological and historical course; one has only to turn his hand to find the works he wishes to consult. Between lectures, masters and pupils are constantly searching right and left through the shelves. The advantages are incalculable.

Flat tables, painted black and furnished with simple ink-stands, extend between the overflowing book-cases. In each room a white porcelain stove, mounted on a pedestal and covered with shining brass ornaments, shines amid the black tables and the musty brown books. The little low windows, of which there are, however, a sufficient number, look out upon the quiet court of the Sorbonne, with the church opposite. The deep-toned clock at every quarter-hour rouses the students bowed over their books. Everywhere there is a calm and studious atmosphere to which even the narrowness of the rooms adds a peculiar charm. Such harmonious surroundings a student will never forget. It seems to me that if the school ever leaves them for grander quarters it will lose something very precious.

Theoretically the students pass three years in the school and are divided in each course into three separate years; but this rule is by no means invariable and students often remain longer. Indeed, most of them stay as long as possible where they never lack instruction, where counsel is lavished upon them by devoted and learned masters and where their first efforts are met with kind and wholesome severity. Many make great sacrifices in order to prolong their stay beyond the regular three years. Not infrequently foreigners, graduates of the best universities, come here to take a year or two under professors whose renown is world-wide. To obtain the diploma—an honor much sought, though given for scientific work alone—a thesis must be presented and accepted by the authorities before the end of the fourth year.

Mr. Alfred Maury is still director of history, with M.

Monod as assistant. The lecturers are MM. Thévenin, Roy, Giry, Hanotaux, and Longnon. There are besides, among the philological courses, lecturers on Greek and Roman antiquities, on epigraphy and paleography, under MM. Rayet, Desjardins and Chatelain, within the limits of history proper. The students, however, attend the lectures as they think best. At the beginning of the year they are obliged to enroll their names for the courses they wish to take, and at each lecture they have to sign the roll, the only means of control in vogue. They have to prepare for oral work and for written work upon special points. All the instruction tends to inculcate strictly scientific methods and to enlist the personal efforts of the student. The organization of this school by M. Duruy, in 1868, was certainly a radical innovation in France.

I cannot here give the full history of the Practical School.[1] I will merely say that one of the difficulties which threatened the enterprise was recruiting pupils. It proved to be no difficulty. From the first year the matriculations surpassed the hopes of the most sanguine. There were, and there still are, as might be expected, few undergraduates from the *Faculté des Lettres*; but many came from special schools to finish their course. Students of the Higher Normal School feel the need of learning Greek paleography, of practice in deciphering, in criticism, or in translation of texts; students from the School of Charters, destined to become archivists and librarians, in great numbers seize the opportunity of extending their knowledge of old French and of romance idioms, or of studying more closely the sources of French history. There are even professors to be found there, as well as employés of public libraries, amateurs, and yearly increasing numbers of foreigners, all seeking advancement in their specialties.

---

[1] The first years of the Practical School were hard ones, especially after the events of 1870 and 1871. That the school did not die then is due largely to the efforts of M. Du Mesnil, director of advanced instruction. (See reports of the history and philology section.)

By order of the Minister, 16th June, 1869, there was begun under the name of Library of the Practical School for Advanced Study, a collection destined to receive the joint works of the classes, together with the individual works of the various members of the school, either pupils or masters. Translations of foreign works, as of Mommsen, Max Müller, G. Curtius, Sohm, etc., are also put there. Among the original historical works are M. Monod's excellent book, Critical Studies upon the Sources of Merovingian History; M. Longnon's first remarkable discussions on the Historical Geography of Gaul; M. Fagniez's interesting studies of Industries and the Industrial classes of Paris in the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries; M. Arthur Giry's beautiful History of the Town of St. Omer and its Institutions up to the fifteenth century; the learned study of the Counts and Viscounts of Limoges previous to the year 1000, by M. de Lasteyrie, etc. Several of these works were honored by the *Académie des inscription et belles-lettres*, and the library has established the reputation of the school throughout France and abroad.[1]

M. Alfred Maury gives no course of lectures, but his assistant, M. Monod, gives two. I have spoken above of the work M. Monod does at the Normal School. Few professors have done as much as he in late years to revolutionize the study of history in France. He created the course of history at the Practical School, he was one of the chief contributors to the *Revue Critique* in its first brilliant stage and he founded, in 1875, the *Revue Historique*. All learned Europe appreciated these two reviews as indices of a decided advance in French science. There is no question that the *Revue Historique* has distanced its oldest rivals at home, while it is most justly celebrated abroad.

M. Monod recently aided actively in the formation of the historical society called *Cercle Saint-Simon*,[2] of which he was

[1] At the Vienna Exposition the Practical School received the only honor awarded to a French scientific institution.

[2] See the *Bulletin* of the society, Jan. 1883.

made president and which will surely have a considerable influence in gathering into one group all those Frenchmen that pursue history from various starting points, but with the same impartially scientific spirit.

I attended two of M. Monod's lectures upon Latin sources of the history of France up to the sixteenth century. The professor alone spoke and the students took notes. There were about twenty present, including a young priest. M. Monod described the historical school at Rheims in the tenth century, and characterized Flodoard and Richer, and the chroniclers of the eleventh century, especially Raoul Glaber. I shall cause no surprise by saying that these lectures of M. Monod's were excellent; his efficiency in this subject, his wisdom, his complete and conscientious investigations are well known. While giving due appreciation to the historical value of these old chroniclers, he gave a graphic sketch of their period and a most curious picture of the intellectual movement in which they had part. As at the Normal School, M. Monod spoke with the utmost simplicity and with modesty amounting almost to timidity. He referred often to monographs and special books. This lecture was charming in its solidity, clearness and orderliness, joined to a picturesque but sober and delicate fashion of characterizing men and times.

M. Monod's second lecture was devoted to true seminary work. I attended two such lectures. A dozen pupils were present and one of them related the result of his personal investigations. He had been studying from sources the very complicated history of King Robert, son of Hugh Capet, and especially the history of his marriages.

The student had done an enormous amount of work and spoke with a sympathetic air of conviction that was charming. He had before him a large bundle of notes and extracts, from which he produced with astonishing memory and rare presence of mind dates, citations of chronicles, texts of charters, discussing and correcting *L'Art de vérifier les dates*, etc. I shall be greatly astonished if this ardent student does not render

history a service when he shall have entered upon his career. I cannot resist the temptation to give his name, which I expect later to see upon books or solid monographs. He was M. Pfister, a third-year student of the Higher Normal School. The rest of the class, a little bewildered by his exuberant learning, took a great many notes and were almost all keenly interested in his inexhaustible developments concerning the wives and the conjugal quarrels of King Robert. The old university-men would have laughed well if they had been present; for the subject and the scrupulous style in which it had been studied would rouse the smile of a superficial hearer. But, for my part, I was delighted. I found again there, in the Sorbonne, that stronghold of university tradition, the same ardor for accurate and persistent work which characterizes German seminaries and I joyfully welcomed it as the history of the future in France. I cannot find words to express how much M. Pfister pleased me with his Benedictine zeal or how gratifying was the interest with which his careful work inspired his fellow-students. Meanwhile M. Monod kept himself in the background as much as possible in order to leave his pupil's originality full play, listening attentively with bowed head, two fingers of his left hand pressed upon his lips or readjusting his eye-glasses from time to time before making slight corrections. After the reading he would begin the discussion, bring out the points more clearly, indicating the results obtained and the questions left obscure. Here, again, I admired the excellent professor's sagacity and tact.

M. Thévenin devotes his time especially to questions of mediæval law. While officer in the French army he was seized with a passion for jurisprudence. He studied law by himself, resigned his commission and went to a German university. In 1870 he was a pupil of Waitz at Göttingen when the Franco-Prussian war broke out. He immediately returned to France, again took arms and went through the campaign of the Loire. After the peace he returned to his favorite studies and, fortunately for the school, attached himself to *L'École Pratique*.

There were five students, three French, one Hungarian and one Roumanian at the two lectures I attended, who were at work upon critical study of the Salic law. At the first of these lectures the subjects were a real-estate claim of the ninth century and an infringement of the right of property. M. Thévenin gave his pupils several documents of the years 867 and 868 to read and requested remarks while he presented a profound commentary upon the texts. All the special procedure of the time was derived from them. Then he went on to a case of brigandage in Dauphiny in 863. Again a pupil was made to read the Latin text of the principal piece, while the professor, with his fine grave head, his black moustache and gray hair, stood erect before the blackboard, buttoned into his straight frock-coat. He wrote slowly the technical expressions of the document, giving their etymology, their various meanings and their weight at different epochs. These explanations of the judicial language of the ninth century were at the same time philological and historical and M. Thévenin presented them clearly and methodically. He ended the lecture by indicating books and treatises to be consulted, referring to French, German and Italian authors.

At the next lecture M. Thévenin began by mentioning and describing the principal works upon the penal procedure of the Merovingians, citing among others the books of M. Thonissen, professor at the Catholic university of Louvain, upon *Le Droit de vengeance dans la législation mérovingienne et la procédure pénale de la loi salique.* Next he entered into general considerations of criminal procedure in cases of murder, rape, abortion and adultery in the ninth century. He wrote continually upon the blackboard decisive quotations or difficult technical terms which he commented upon or explained. Notwithstanding the dryness of the subject his teaching was very spirited. Even so incompetent a listener as I would feel from the very start that he was in the hands of a master sure of his subject and as conscientious as he was learned.

One of M. Roy's lectures turned upon sources of history of

the thirteenth century; unfortunately I was unable to attend it, but I heard two of his lectures upon the relations between Church and State in France, from Clovis to St. Louis. Nine students were present and took notes all the time. M. Roy had before him on the table the principal texts and German works treating of the relations between Pepin the Short and the papacy. He turned ceaselessly from one to another, consulting his extracts, reading important passages from chronicles and from lives and letters of the popes, and discussed all this evidence with great clearness and extreme care. He described, in a very instructive manner the *Vita Stephani* and the other documents of the *Liber Pontificalis*, the *Codex Carolinus*, etc. His digression upon the title of patrician conferred upon Pepin and his descendants was also very well made. The lecture was clear and strong.

M. Giry gave a lecture upon the origin and development of municipal institutions in the provinces of Central France in the Middle Ages, and another upon diplomatic sources of French history in the seventh and eighth centuries. I found lively pleasure in attending several of his lectures. In the one upon municipal institutions the professor, in the first place, designated one pupil to study the Stamp Charters, with recourse to the texts themselves and with Augustin Thierry as a guide, while to another he assigned the study of the customary law of *Lorris*; then he went on to the charters of Orléans during the twelfth century. He had six pupils.

M. Giry read numerous extracts from charters in a great folio of *Ordonnances royales* which he had open before him, or mentioned special treatises which he had taken care to bring to the lecture and which he circulated amongst the pupils, remarking upon the value and the conclusions reached in the monographs. The subject of the lecture was captivating and the great ability of M. Giry needs no comment. The grave and resonant voice of the professor, as he spoke with nervous conviction, added much to the charm of his teaching.

His lecture upon the diplomatic sources of French history

was also very interesting. M. Giry distributed to his six pupils fac-similes of a diploma of Philip the Fair, given at Courtrai in 1297, by which he raised the Count of Anjou to the dignity of peer of France. The document was first deciphered, then thoroughly commented upon. The professor added some instructive digressions upon the ecclesiastical and lay peers of France, upon the genesis of the royal diploma, upon notaries and signatures, upon the use of French in the royal documents beginning with St. Louis, etc. Then he went on to a letter patent of the same king, given at the town of Ypres in 1296, and to several other documents of the same reign which were read by the students and carefully discussed in common. The professor conducted these exercises in diplomatic criticism with remarkable interest and accuracy.

In another lecture M. Giry first related the origin of tabellions and manorial, royal, imperial and papal notaries, and he entered into exact details upon the formulas of private deeds, especially deeds of donation to convents and churches as well as acts of amortization which appeared in the thirteenth century. Next he called the attention of his pupils to two instruments in the archives of *Loir-et-Cher*, discovered by him and believed to be false. He dictated them in full, urging his pupils to study them with care during their holidays and comment upon them in writing, in the attempt to discover in what interest they were forged and at what period. Upon their return in October the conclusions at which each one had arrived were examined in common, and from this collective work sprang a treatise eventually to be inserted in the "Library" of the school. I was happy to be present at this interesting *séance* because it enabled me to see the actual working of the school in urging the students to individual exertion and associating with them their master as guide and fellow-labourer.

The two lectures by M. Hanotaux had for subjects history of the reign of Louis XIII and *Mémoires* of Cardinal Richelieu. The professor had reached in the Memoirs the assassination of Henry IV by Ravaillac. In this connection he gave to his

three pupils the bibliography of the question, with a great many very exact and very curious directions. Then he gave a brief history of the theory of regicide, from Thomas Aquinas to the Jesuits, passing by the sectarian Protestants of the sixteenth century. He next considered the part played by the secretary *ayant la main*, that is to say, skilled in counterfeiting his master's handwriting, so as to save him the tediousness of writing what, according to etiquette, must be in autograph. He here inserted some general observations upon the transformations in French script in the seventeenth century. The lecture was carried on in a conversational tone and the students frequently exchanged observations with the professor.

I attended two of M. Hanotaux's lectures upon the sources of history of Louis XIII. There were three pupils present and the subject was Bassompierre. M. Hanotaux began by discussing the value of the manuscripts of Paris, of Meaux and of the British Museum. He also passed in review the printed editions, and in this connection laid down the rules for publication of texts of the Middle Ages and early modern times as regards orthography, punctuation, division into paragraphs, the use of capitals, etc. Each rule was accompanied by illustrations taken from the most carefully executed editions, like the *Saint-Simon* of M. de Boislisle. He made fine and original observations. M. Hanotaux next went into a detailed criticism of the latest edition of Bassompierre's *Mémoires*, published by M. de Chanterac in 1870–1877. After this introduction he carefully discussed the historical value of these memoirs and their sequel, printed for the first time in the year X. He constantly referred to printed works, to other contemporary memoirs and to unedited documents from collections. He stopped particularly at the episode of the siege of Rochelle and rapidly described the other sources of information. The pupils were deeply interested and interrupted from time to time. After the lecture a Switzer, who had been reared in England, asked advice of the professor concerning a work he had in hand bearing upon the relations between

Switzerland and France in the fifteenth century. M. Hanotaux furnished him all sorts of references with the best possible grace. Though so accomplished a professor he appeared quite young. Of small build, thin and nervous, shaking his little head, while his piercing eyes gleamed from behind his glasses, he spoke with untiring volubility. One would recognize at first sight a genius and a stubborn worker. His picturesque and telling delivery and his amiability toward his pupils reinforced his solid and scholarly teaching. He has magnificent spirit and his teaching is undoubtedly among the best and most stirring in *L'École Pratique.*

M. Longnon is also to be reckoned among the youngest and most remarkable professors in the school. His subject is the historical geography of France and French names of places, their origin, meaning and transformations. I heard him explain in detail to his nine pupils the ecclesiastical geography of a part of France in the Middle Ages. He passed in review the bishoprics, arch-deaconries, arch-presbyteries and deaneries, tracing them with his finger upon a large colored map spread out before him and referring continually to the little cards which held his notes.[1] M. Longnon enlivened this somewhat dry enumeration by interesting explanations and discussions. After the lecture he told me that he had for several years been preparing for Hachette a large historical atlas of France which would relieve him from giving this course of lectures where he had to dictate long lists of names. In fact, the students took a great many notes; they appreciated that they were before the creator of a new science.

The lecture on the origin of names of places interested me supremely. Five students attended it. One of them gave his personal researches upon the names of the Canton d'Anglure (Marne), his native country. He had made a very serious

[1] The use of cards, about twice the size of a visiting card, upon which to write their notes for extemporaneous lectures, is quite common among professors at Paris.

study of their etymology and their earliest mention in chronicles and charters. M. Longnon frequently interrupted in a spirited style to make a correction or to appeal to principles that he had laid down in his first lectures, which formed a complete system. He occasionally rose to take down from the shelves a volume of Littré or Du Cange to verify some etymological hypothesis. It was seminary work in the highest sense, and M. Longnon directed it with astonishing sagacity, condescending from time to time to a little pleasantry and guiding his pupil with great friendliness. His fine and expressive figure recalled the types of the seventeenth century, his forehead, nose, moustache and tapering beard being quite in harmony with them. His eyes, sometimes dull and sometimes flashing, completed the striking picture. M. Longnon expressed to me his satisfaction with his pupil's researches in the Canton d'Anglure, but he told me that this was the only one this year who had undertaken any personal work. He had himself been obliged to make almost all the contributions to the course. He hoped, he told me, that when he had published his theoretical works actually in preparation, he would be able to dispense with giving his pupils a long *exposé* of the principles of historical geography and to exact from them without respite the practical exercises which would call into play further the spirit of *L'École Pratique*. "That is all they need!"

Among the courses in philology which are attached to history, I attended the lectures of MM. Rayet and Chatelain. M. Olivier Rayet, assistant director of Hellenic philology, besides his lectures upon the Akropolis at Athens and Greek epigraphy, expounded Book V of the description of Greece by Pausanias. His class numbered eight. One of them translated Chapter XXIV, and gave historical and archæological explanations which he had prepared with great care, using notes. M. Rayet touched up the description as occasion required. At one time he traced on the blackboard an inscription given by Pausanias, but writing it as it has recently been

found. This was naturally the starting point for observations, conjectures and valuable suggestions. Again, when Pausanias referred to Homer, M. Rayet took down the Iliad and read and commented upon the passage alluded to. When a certain sculptor was cited by Pausanias, the professor wrote out his genealogy upon the blackboard and traced the signatures of the artist as found upon two of his works. In connection with a point of topography he displayed the charts of some officers in the English marine, and of MM. Pottier and S. Reinach relating to Myrina and vicinity, adding some interesting observations upon the Greek colonization of Asia Minor, upon the great pan-hellenic games, and upon the manufacture of arms in prehistoric Greece. This course was as scholarly as it was sympathetic, combining to perfection the personal work of the pupil with the watchful and kindly help of the master.

M. Chatelain's lectures upon the elements of Latin paleography also left a very agreeable impression. The professor had before his six pupils the great work of M. Léopold Delisle upon the manuscripts of the National Library at Paris.[1] He ran over the plates to point out to the class the signs by which the time and source of manuscripts of the Middle Ages are discovered. He called attention to the quality of the parchment, the color of the ink, the formation of letters, the abbreviations and changes in writing down to the sixteenth century. Another lesson he devoted to miniatures. To support his theories and precepts he continually displayed magnificent chromolithograph plates from Silvestre's Universal Paleography,[2] and from M. Ed. Fleury's collections in connection with the manuscripts of Laon and Soissons.[3] M. Chatelain thus traced, documents in hand, a general sketch of the history

---

[1] *Le Cabinet des manuscrits de la Bibliothèque nationale*, a study of the origin of this depository, including the elements of a history of calligraphy, of the art of miniatures, of book-binding and book-trade in Paris before the invention of printing.

[2] London, 1850, 2 vols.

[3] *Manuscrits à miniatures de la bibliothèque de Laon*, 1863—*de Soissons*, 1865.

of miniatures, beginning from the Merovingian and Byzantine manuscripts. The professor timidly and modestly kept himself in the background, but the penetrating influence of his essentially practical and natural teaching was only the better felt.

Now that I have attempted to give a detailed account of the most excellent impression which the historical teaching of *L'École Pratique des hautes études* has left on my mind, I cannot conclude without recording my recognition and admiration of the man who was its creator[1] at a time when the *Facultés des lettres* were still stuck fast in the ancient track. "We are led to believe," an official document of one of the ministers of public instruction well says,[2] "that M. Duruy meditated a general reform in advanced teaching; but he judged that the proper moment had not yet come; he foresaw a resistance too strong to be rashly encountered. Less sure of others than of himself, he sought a beginning and found *L'École pratique des hautes études*. . . . He counted upon a penetrating force which has, in truth, manifested itself and which has persisted although he is no longer here to direct it."

V.—The Faculty of Arts, Master's Degree and History Fellowships.

It is vain to look to-day in the *Faculté des lettres* at Paris for courses in history, such as M. Duruy in 1868 satirized as purely oratorical in the official documents which I cited above. Beside the strolling auditors, who cannot be excluded since the lectures are public, each professor has veritable students who take notes; and it is for them, not for the floating audience, that he speaks; they are the ones he gathers at his feet. Thus, in his lectures upon the formation of the Prussian state

[1] Professors and pupils paid a touching tribute of gratitude to M. Duruy in dedicating to him their volume of *Miscellanies*, published in 1878 in honor of their 10th anniversary.

[2] *Statistique de l'enseignement supérieur*, 1878, p. 717, note.

which drew often 300 auditors and sixty to seventy of them ladies, M. Ernest Lavisse rigorously reserved the first rows of seats for *students*. Moreover, there are now a certain number of courses not public, to which only those who have been matriculated can be admitted upon presentation of a card, given them at the time of enrollment. The first time I presented myself at one of these lectures I was pitilessly repulsed by an incorruptible usher who had been trained in a masterly manner. Although very courteous, he was immovable and referred me to the dean, M. Himly, who kindly hastened to give me a card of admittance. These courses, which the notices did not then distinguish from the public courses, are this year marked C. F., *Cours fermé*. They are an excellent innovation and have contributed much to improve history at the Faculty of Arts.

But, as M. Duruy comprehended fifteen years ago, the first need was to substitute true students for the ever-shifting audience. Undoubtedly the great minister would have given all his attention to this point if he could have remained longer in office; but he left the ministry in 1869, a few months after having broken the ground for his great reforms, and the tragic events of 1870–1871 soon postponed the whole question. After sad loss of time, the Republic took up the interrupted task and one of its best ministers of public instruction, M. Waddington, who was perfectly familiar with the question from his connection with *L'École Pratique*, created a regular army of working students by instituting scholarships.[1] The situation of the Faculties might well be despaired of when they were obliged to resort to so artificial and humiliating a measure, while *L'École Pratique* had prospered for ten years with its

[1] These scholarships are awarded annually by examination. The candidates take the examinations in Paris or in the academic centres. Their corrected papers are sent to the minister of public instruction and submitted at Paris to a special commission, together with notes of the rank taken by each candidate in his oral examinations.

pupils unrewarded; but the minister had judged wisely,[1] and from that moment the Faculty of Arts had *students* all over France—a considerable gain.

These scholarship-holders, who form the nucleus of every course, prepare for examinations for their degrees. The masters' purses are 1,200 francs and were instituted, as I have said, by M. Waddington. The fellowship purses are 1,500 francs, instituted by M. Jules Ferry during his first term as minister.

Another useful reform has been the appointment of lecturers in connection with the Faculties. Their rôle corresponds, to a certain extent, with that of the tutor (*privat-docent*) in German universities; they supplement the instruction of the titular professors, giving courses if needed and coming to the aid of students between lectures. They are generally fellows or even doctors. At Paris they have a salary of 6,000 francs and are nominated by the minister and the Faculty. Outside of Paris the minister alone nominates, the salary varying from 3,600 to 4,000 francs; he may grant 4,500 or 5,000 francs to one having a doctor's degree. The lecturers are appointed for one year only but their term may be extended. At Paris the Faculty make the necessary recommendations to the minister annually.

Theoretically the position of lecturer is a sort of probation, after which a competent young teacher can be appointed to a professorship in some Faculty of secondary importance. In their last reports, M. Berthelot, for the Faculty of Sciences, and M. Bréal, for that of Arts, urgently remind the minister of the spirit of the institution. It happens that at Paris the lecturers are taken in general from among the young scholars, who wish to remain in the capital, and are willing to wait

---

[1] I note, in passing, M. Monod's pamphlet of 1876, entitled "*De la possibilité d'une réforme de l'enseignement supérieure*, (Paris, Leroux). The book especially commended the institution of scholarships. The author at the same time recommended to the ministry the suppression of the fellowship examinations. It is thus evident that M. Monod took part in the two reforms soon after accomplished.

patiently until a chair there becomes vacant. This is a bad state of affairs, since it tends to block the supply of good professors for provincial Faculties. It is, however, only a trifling fault of system, easy to remedy; and the institution of lecturers, by singularly favoring the recruitment of professorial corps and enlarging the range of specialties once too narrow, will contribute much to the elevation of the Faculties.

But I am writing about history. Since 1880 there has been a special degree in history,[1] besides the fellowship in history, so that the Faculties actually count almost all their students as specialists in history. They are particularly numerous at Paris. This marks, in my opinion, the restoration of the study of history in France.

The history degree requires a written and an oral examination, including both general and special tests. The former consists chiefly of an essay in French upon some subject of ethics, criticism or French literature; of a Latin essay upon some question of Latin or Greek literature, and of exposition of one Latin, one Greek and one French author. The special tests consist of an essay on ancient history (Greek or Roman), one upon mediæval or modern history, one upon a question of geography, and, finally, oral questions upon ancient, mediæval and modern history and geography, according to a list arranged by the minister.

In an explanatory circular of 5th August, 1881, M. Jules Ferry said: "The institution of the degree in history and geography has for its aim to provide for our colleges, and even in some cases for our lyceums, professors in history and geography, who have received a broad literary culture, as well as general instruction in history and geography. Between the examination for the master's degree in history and geography, and for the fellowship in the same branches, there is not only

[1] The decree of M. Ferry is dated 25th December, 1880, but it stipulates that the examinations cannot be taken until the beginning of the July session in 1882.

a difference in severity, but a difference in kind. We demand of the candidate for the fellowship proof, not only of general information but of fitness for personal work, and of scholarly investigation."

The fellowship examination is composed of crucial written tests and an oral examination. Its aim is to ascertain at one stroke the general knowledge, professional aptitude and scientific aptitude of the candidate. The tests of general information are four theses in ancient, mediæval and modern history, and in geography. Each must be written in six hours, upon a subject not beforehand known. M. Lavisse, in an address, delivered in December, 1880, from which I have borrowed much information, has set forth all the vague terrors of these examinations.[1]

The examinations, which are intended to test the professional aptitude, are: correction of papers, the history lesson and the geography lesson. The former consists in drawing by lot a paper from the receipts of the general examination, reading it in retirement in an hour's time, and making the corrections before the jury in a half-hour. Says M. Lavisse: "It is an artificial test, which lengthens without profit the duration of a fatiguing examination. Its suppression has been repeatedly demanded; some day it will be granted. Very serious, however, is the trial in the history and geography lesson. The subject being given out twenty-four hours in advance, and always chosen from the records of the lyceums, the test is actually from the very life of a professor. Here, unquestionably, professorial aptitude can be clearly revealed, for here appear the ruling qualities: method, simplicity, precision and clearness."

The tests of scholarship are theses and exposition of authors. In 1882 the authors given were: Book VII of Thucydides, Book V of Pausanias; the twelfth oration of Cicero against

[1] Article by M. Lavisse, in *Revue internationale de l'Enseignement*, for 13th February, 1881.

Rullus, and the first forty-one chapters of Book II of Livy, the Periplus of the Euxine by Arrian, and Book XVIII of Montesquieu's *Esprit des lois*. These theses bear upon the Roman agrarian laws from the time of the Gracchi inclusive to the end the Republic, upon the relations between the Popes and the Carlovingians up to the eighth century and upon the condition of France in 1789.

The subjects prescribed for theses are divided into a certain number of lectures, and each candidate receives by lot his appointment to prepare a lecture in twenty-four hours. The same drawing appoints one of the competitors to hear the lecture and afterward to argue the opposite view.

I delay describing M. Lavisse's lecture in order to give a detailed criticism of all these examinations. In spite of certain faults, the system is, as a whole, formidable and truly scientific.

The regular course in history, at the Faculty, is of four years' duration. It is divided into two equal parts by the examinations for the degree and for the fellowship.

Left to their own resources, the candidates would be scarcely capable of preparing all the subjects for these two examinations. Accordingly appeal is made to the professors at the College of France, to professors and lecturers of the Faculty as well as to directors and professors of *L'École Pratique*, some of whom lecture also at *L'École des Chartes* and *L'École Normale*. There is thus formed a complete programme of history and geography courses, which may be said to rank with those of the great German universities. A special circular, linking fraternally the professors of these various institutions, triumphantly remarks this great progress of the last few years, much credit of which M. Lavisse can claim.[1]

Most of these courses are not public. The closed courses are a radical innovation for France where all higher instruction was formerly public. They are given in newly built

[1] The *Revue internationale de l'Enseignement* for 15th December, 1882, publishes this circular for the current year, pp. 586–588.

halls, near the old Sorbonne and named *nouvelles salles* or *baraquements Gerson*. They are temporary structures, lightly built, well ventilated and well lighted, contrasting favorably with the ancient lecture-rooms of the Faculty, and recalling by their name and their convenient style the *Barakken-Auditorium* of the University of Berlin. History has here, like literature and philosophy, its own territory. It possesses a vast lecture-hall, a laboratory for students and a study for professors. The lecture-hall, standing behind the church of the Sorbonne, is constructed chiefly of wood. Enormous windows, on two sides, let in floods of light. One would almost fancy himself in a photographer's studio, were it not for the flat tables, painted black, and the numerous maps adorning the white-washed walls. A little platform, bearing a table of white wood and a cane-bottomed armchair, is placed for the lecturer. This airy, cheerful hall breathes a freshness and cleanliness seldom found in university quarters.

But it was the work-room which especially attracted my attention. When I visited it a large number of students were there reading and making extracts. Upon the shelves of the little reference-library, I remarked the German physical and historical atlases of Stieler, Kiepert, Sprüner, etc., together with several collections and works of weight in French and German. Three written notices were fastened upon the wall. The first contained a list of new books, an excellent measure long in vogue abroad. The second read: "Notice.—The students are informed that a register is put at their disposal to receive the names of the books they wish the reference-library to procure." Here, again, they have imitated a useful custom of Germany. The third notice was the library regulations:

"No book can be taken out of the room.

"Students are requested to return books to their places after using them.

"Silence must be kept in the study-hall.

"When conversatiom is necessary students may retire to the lecture-rooms that are unoccupied.

"M. Uri (librarian) has control of the study-hall.

"The directors of the lectures in literature, grammar and history[1] reserve the privilege of withdrawing the use of the study-hall from students who transgress the rules."

It is thus evident that history can boast at Paris its own little establishment, modestly set up, but organized in a most intelligent fashion. I would almost have believed myself in the quarters of an historical seminary in Leipzig.[2]

The courses in preparation for the degree and the fellowship in history constitute the most recent and consequently the most interesting part of historical teaching at Paris. I studied them carefully and with extreme satisfaction.

I was unable to attend M. Lavisse's public course upon the formation of the Prussian State, the course having been finished before my arrival in Paris in June, 1882. I regretted it extremely; but I can see what the teaching of this eminent professor is from his lectures to the candidates for the degree and the fellowships. M. Lavisse, graduated from *L'École Normale* in 1865, at first taught in several *lycées* and was the private secretary and fellow-worker of M. Duruy. In 1872 he asked and obtained leave of absence which he spent in visiting several German universities. Upon his return he was appointed to a part of the history teaching at the Normal School. M. Monod, indeed, took his place, when he himself, in 1880, supplied the place of M. Fustel de Coulanges at the Faculty of Arts. His scholarship, energy, the clearness of his views, his professional talent, his devotion to his pupils, all make him the soul of the dawning reform which will, I doubt not, make itself felt in the study of history throughout France.

I heard M. Lavisse give several very striking lectures upon the France and Germany of the Middle Ages. In a few

---

[1] This regulation is the same for each of the lecture-halls of the three sections and for their respective study-halls.

[2] Compare what I have said in my article in *Revue de l'instruction publique en Belgique*, cited above.

artistic, precise and sharply drawn lines he characterized Philip Augustus and St. Louis, continually citing passages from contemporary writers and documents. At another time he rapidly sketched the assembly-roll of great men in France down to the thirteenth century, and warmly recommended this to his pupils as a subject for study, referring to the example of Germany, which has long since persistently cleared away the briars from its mediæval epoch. Finally, I attended two lectures in which M. Lavisse set forth the struggles of Germany against the Slaves and Hungarians in the early Middle Ages. He constantly referred, with precision, to passages of ancient chroniclers and to the best works of German historians. The professor himself declared that this course was elementary, rapid, and given in general preparation for the fellowship examination. At every step in his brilliant discourse M. Lavisse threw out original observations with moderation, accuracy and clearness, with a striking soundness which was often and unexpectedly enhanced by a piquant word, an ironical reflection, a picturesque detail, or a sharp running fire, delivered with a resolute voice, vibrating with conviction and contagious animation. The pupils, numbering from twenty to fifty, according to the course, listened with almost passionate attention and eagerly devoured the master's words. The lecture was full of ideas, of large, deep and extremely suggestive views, the professor pointing out obscurities at each step and inviting his hearers to clear them up some day by their own personal work. This theoretical course of M. Lavisse actually seemed to me the best in the whole domain of history at Paris.

In 1881, M. Lavisse carried on a practical course in which, for an hour and a half per week, he studied, with his numerous pupils, documents relating to the institutions of France under Charles VII.

In 1882, the subjects from the Middle Ages for the fellowship examination being treated by M. Roy, M. Lavisse had no practical course, and devoted himself to theory, in which he is beyond all rivalry. It is much to be regretted that a man of

his worth should have to make his teaching conform to the exigencies of preparation for a professional examination.

M. Alfred Rambaud treated the history of the nineteenth century, having about fifteen pupils. I heard him explain in two lectures the rôles of Prussia and Austria since 1848, and sketch the prolegomena of German unity and Italian unity, which have been realized in our time, thanks to the genius of Bismarck and Cavour. M. Rambaud, as may be imagined, was not enthusiastic over contemporary Germany. His discourse was full of accurately stated facts, piquant anecdotes and references to all sorts of documents, and was characterized by admirable clearness and elevation of thought. He described with rare felicity princes, statesmen and circumstances, and he excelled in interesting his audience by his originality, freedom and nice distinctions. It was an excellent course, very acute and charming, one of the best I heard in Paris.

M. George Perrot, after having expounded Arrian's Periplus of the Euxine, devoted his last lectures to questions of archæology. He gave the earliest origin of money amongst the Egyptians, Babylonians, Chinese, Jews, Greeks and Romans, as well as the changes it has undergone among uncivilized races down to our own time. He referred to the works of MM. Lenormant, Waddington, Brandis, Mommsen, etc., and quoted his own works with great modesty. The lectures were delightful, full of curious notions and piquant details, and delivered with extreme simplicity, although in very elegant form. He had about fifteen auditors.

The same number of students were present at M. Arthur Giry's lectures upon mediæval paleography. The professor first gave some theoretical principles for the documents of the period, their different parts and their principal marks. Then he distributed some splendid heliograph fac-similes[1] which the students read under his direction while he commented upon

[1] A publication of the ministry of the interior, entitled, *Musée des archives nationales, Musée des archives départementales.*

them step by step. M. Giry's remarks upon the invocation, the superscription, preface, statement, purport, conclusion, signs of validity, date and signature were embellished with examples, observations and characteristic touches. It was, in very truth, the history of a diploma of the Middle Ages, sought out to the smallest detail with perfect clearness and order. The two lectures, by M. Giry, which I had the pleasure of attending, were certainly models. Such brilliant teaching of paleography and diplomatics ought to have an excellent influence in the formation of future professors, inspiring them with a love for such study, which is too rare in higher grades of teaching. How many professors in *lycées* and colleges in small towns would be made useful by the possession of solid notions of paleography, which would enable them to work accurately their local archives?

M. Bouché-Leclercq expounded Cicero's oration against Rullus, the subject appointed for the fellowship examination. Zumpt's edition was used. The four students present had conscientiously prepared the text and put to the professor a multitude of questions on points that had embarrassed them. All the explanations asked were in the line of history and Roman antiquity. M. Bouché-Leclercq answered the questions with great affability, placed his pupils upon an equality with himself and freely gave them the benefit of his learning. At one time he was called upon to describe Cicero's restless figure, which he did in charming style, referring to his best-known letters. Again, a student asked an explanation which M. Bouché-Leclercq could not give *ex abrupto*, whereupon he brought the necessary volumes of Lange and Pauly and carefully showed his hearers how to make investigations in such works. He took the occasion to prove that, except in case of a prodigious memory, learning does not consist so much in knowing all points as in being able to find quickly the solutions already provided by science. It was a striking lecture, scholarly and valuable for working pupils.

M. Pigeonneau described the state of France in 1789. I

heard him speak upon the nobility according to the accounts given by intendants and the works of De Tocqueville and Taine. His lecture was spirited, clear, interesting and full of good humor. Amongst his many hearers were two priests.

M. Berthold Zeller treated the history of the regency of Maria de' Medici. In the lecture I attended he stated the condition of the German protestants and of the French Huguenots at the time of the Thirty Years War. His discourse was full and conscientious, although a little dull. He cited no sources nor any modern history. Nine students were present and took notes from time to time.

MM. Pigeonneau and Zeller also directed the lectures given by the candidates in preparation for the pedagogic contest of the fellowship examination. Eleven students were present at M. Pigeonneau's practical course. One of them was at the desk and gave a lecture upon the privileges and exemptions in France before 1789. It was chiefly derived from De Tocqueville and Taine. The student spoke without notes and had prepared his subject well. When the discourse was over, M. Pigeonneau, who had listened sitting upon the corner of a bench at the foot of the desk, invited the students to make comments. The critics immediately fell upon the speaker, who lost his temper and declared with a vexed air that he had spent seven hours in preparing his lecture. They debated long and vigorously, M. Pigeonneau keeping himself in the background to give the pupils full play. At the close he appointed the next candidate to speak upon municipal organization in 1789 and suggested, especially, De Tocqueville and the book of M. Babeau.

I attended two of the lectures given by M. Zeller's pupils. The first dealt with the Roman provinces in the Augustan age. The pupil stood before a great Kiepert map and spoke without notes. His twelve companions opposed him with spirit and M. Zeller took up the subject in his turn, completing it and making certain slight corrections. The second lecture was upon the state of Europe at the death of St. Louis.

The speaker reviewed all the countries of the East and the West, giving some rapid suggestions upon each with a great many dates, the whole perhaps taken from M. Duruy's *Histoire du moyen âge;* then he added some quite superficial remarks upon modern language and literature, science and art. None of his class-mates had any argument against him. M. Zeller, who had at hand his notes written on great sheets of paper, read them to show the student that he had not said all he might have said and had omitted a great number of dates. At the close he appointed the reign of the Emperor Trajan as the subject next in order.

M. Auguste Himly, dean of the Faculty of Arts, has charge of the lectures on geography. He conducted them faultlessly, as only twice attending convinced me. A student gave the lesson from a large coast map of France, extending from the North Sea to the Pyrenees. He began by giving some coast details of the county of Flanders, and of the ancient salt-marshes of Artois, and continued the description to the Bay of Biscay, multiplying hydrographic, commercial, historical and scenic details, and treating the vast subject calmly and clearly. No one of the class offered at first any objections. M. Himly, however, after having called it a respectable third class lesson, made a series of very just, severe but kindly criticisms. He referred to successive maps of the coast of France, contained in M. Desjardin's book upon Gaul. Then he took up the question of seaports, which he treated in a masterly manner. In this connection he accused Paris of exerting a fatal influence upon French ports, in developing them only in proportion to the services they can render to the capital. Bordeaux is thus sacrificed, and almost all the important canals have been built with a view to Parisian interests. He pointed out to the student that he had said nothing of the continual spring of Roscoff, in Brittany, where the fig-tree grows, nor of the Isles of Normandy, and himself supplied the defect by very interesting information. In short he delivered his advice and his criticisms with charming deli-

cacy, pleasantry and grace. At the close he made an urgent appeal to the class to offer some observations on the lesson, and four or five finally hazarded some remarks. They made some criticisms of detail, which were briefly discussed, but their reserve can well be understood from their knowledge that no one could more profitably point out errors than their wise and sympathetic master.

The second student's lecture that I heard dealt with the basin of the Garonne. The lecture was delivered with great spirit by a Gascon, well up in the history of his native valley. M. Himly praised him, and gave the signal to the critics, who this time did not wait to be urged, but debated earnestly with the Gascon the merits of the Garonne, of Bordeaux, and its vineyards and many of the local glories boasted by the young student. M. Himly in turn took up the question of vines and treated it with sparkling humor. He then spoke of the Basques, briefly but in a clear and helpful style; finally he stated the characteristics of the region drained by the Garonne and its tributaries, frequently calling history to the aid of geography. He scattered little good-natured hints throughout his criticisms: "When you describe a basin," he said, "it is not necessary to keep to the river bank, with your feet always in the water. You must go from right to left to study the country which the watercourse drains." And in this familiar and graphic style, he gave pedagogic hints of great value, with extreme tact, authority and good feeling. I am sure M. Himly must be idolized by his pupils. His class numbered twenty-five at each lecture.

I was struck with the unusually earnest and noble countenances of the majority of the candidates for the degree and the fellowship; they constitute in fact an intellectual élite, and several of them have already attained higher professorships. These frank, sensitive and intelligent faces confirmed the excellent impression which all this special teaching had produced in my mind. The pupils seemed to me worthy of their masters.

Beside the lectures given in the *baraquements Gerson* the history students can take at *L'École pratique* the courses of MM. Monod, Thévenin, Rayet and Roy, of which I spoke above; and the special notice to the candidates for the degree and fellowship mentions also the public lectures on history and geography of the *Faculté des lettres.*

At the latter place I found the dean, M. Himly, who this year was giving American geography. The vast lecture-room of the Faculty was well filled. A few ladies were present. M. Himly spoke of the basin of the St. Lawrence, holding in one hand a great sheet of paper blackened with notes and figures upon which he cast, from time to time, a hasty glance, while in his other hand he brandished a paper-cutter with which to point out upon the beautiful outline-map by Sydow every place of which he spoke. His statements were sound, the details interesting, the points well made and observations spirited. Enthusiastic applause greeted the eminent professor when he ceased speaking,[1] although he had taken twenty minutes more than the regular time.

M. Bouché-Leclercq discussed the religious institutions of the Romans. Seated behind a semi-circular desk at the bottom of a sort of pit—the place reserved for the professor in the old lecture-hall of the Faculty at the Sorbonne—M. Bouché-Leclercq embodied in his lecture the greater part of his beautiful work, *la Divination chez les Romains.* The audience was quite mixed, six ladies and one priest being in attendance. The lecture was striking, attractive, scholarly, and given with elegant simplicity, relieved from time to time by cutting and delicate irony.

M. Pigeonneau commented at the Sorbonne upon the political economy of Colbert with the same volubility, good

---

[1] I cannot refrain from citing here the principal work of M. Himly, which I procured at Paris and which has already done me great service: *Histoire de la formation territoriale des États de l'Europe centrale*, 2 vols., Hachette.

nature and ease with which he conducted his lectures in Gerson Hall. His audience was limited to one.

M. Alfred Rambaud gave an excellent lecture upon France and Russia in the eighteenth century. He had chosen a very singular hour for a public lecture, from half-past four till half-past five in the evening, the time when the Sorbonne is deserted. Consequently, in spite of the supreme worth of his utterances, he spoke to almost empty benches. I heard three of these lectures. The first time I counted eleven hearers, two of them ladies; the second time the audience was composed of eighteen men and five ladies; the third time there were only eleven men and nine ladies. But it was a case where the masses were in the wrong, for M. Rambaud's lectures were wonderful.

The professor showed how the Russians, who had up to that time imitated the Germans, perceived during Elizabeth's reign that the latter nation was but an imitation of France and immediately a violent infatuation for France overspread Russia. M. Rambaud drew a very graphic and amusing sketch. In the following lecture he passed on to Catherine II and characterized the principal sources of history of the revolution of 1762, which placed this remarkable woman on the throne of the Czars. After this examination of sources he related the incidents of the conspiracy, discussing the various contemporary accounts, from which he read interesting extracts. A rare exception amongst French professors, M. Rambaud read rather indifferently, but he spoke with animation and faultless simplicity and depicted all the intrigues of palace and barracks with wonderful vigor.

In a third lecture I heard M. Rambaud describe some truly remarkable features of Catherine's administration; as when in 1766 she assembled at Moscow a sort of parliament, composed of more than 600 delegates from her immense states and constituting an ethnographical exhibition, as M. Rambaud well said, rather than a deliberative assembly. He related in detail the vicissitudes of this unprecedented council, which

finally ended in pitiable failure. Then he gave the history of the famous contests instituted by Catherine II to promote the discussion of the abolition of serfdom. All Europe sent a flood of manuscripts and one from Aix-la-Chapelle took the prize. It is unnecessary to add that it was never published. In this connection M. Rambaud traced the origin of serfdom in Russia in the seventeenth century and described the heart-rending condition of Russian slaves a century after their subjection. But I cannot here analyze the lecture; it was admirable in its clearness, simplicity and originality.

These public courses at the *Faculté* have one marked point of difference from those at the *baraquements Gerson*. The door of the hall is constantly swinging at the convenience of the people who go up and down the little staircase, with more or less noise and with the same freedom as at the *Collège de France*. One often meets curious specimens among the audience here, too. I noticed specially an old lady who invariably arrived a quarter hour late and began imperturbably to take notes even before she reached her seat. Nor was there lack of old gentlemen, full of dignity and sleep. But at each lecture the first two rows of seats were filled with students who earnestly noted the professor's words and formed an appreciative audience. It was unquestionably a great improvement on the past.

Having reached the end of my only too inadequate observation of historical courses at Paris, I cannot refrain from paying my debt of thanks to MM. Lavisse, Monod, Giry and Rambaud for their generous reception and the cordial aid and hospitality they unceasingly offered me throughout my stay in Paris. Furthermore, the many professors with whom I had the honor to be thrown all showed the utmost good-will.

VI.—Conclusion.

To deliver a comprehensive judgment of the higher teaching of history at Paris, after only one month's study of the situation is an embarrassing task. However, in summing up my impressions I should say they have passed through three successive phases.

In the first place I was astonished at the number and variety of the historical courses offered by the *Collège de France*, the *Sorbonne*, the *École pratique des hautes études*, the *École des Chartes* and the *École normale*, not to mention the Free School of Political Science, which was just closing its academic year and which I was not able to visit.[1]

In 1881–1882 there was at Paris a course in the history of religions, dealing specially with the Chinese religion, and a course upon the migrations of peoples and the prehistoric antiquities of Europe. In ancient history the main points were: private life of the Athenians, Greek sculpture, the Akropolis at Athens, religious institutions of Rome, agrarian laws of Rome under the Republic, Roman history since the Gracchi, epigraphy of Roman Gaul, etc.

For mediæval history there were: critical history of the first Capetians, struggles of the Popes and Carlovingian princes, history of royal power in France and Germany, formation of the Prussian state, comparative history of civil and political institutions of Europe from the tenth to the sixteenth century, critical study of Latin sources of French history, diplomatic sources of French history from the seventh to the sixteenth century, ancient institutions of France, origin and development of municipal institutions in Central France in the Middle Ages, sources of French history in the twelfth century, archæology of the Middle Ages, etc.

In modern history there were courses upon policies of French Kings, from Henry IV to Louis XV; sources of history of

[1] In 1882 this school finished its eleventh year under the excellent direction of M. Em. Boutmy. Its aim is to prepare especially for diplomatic service, for statesmanship, for administration and for finance and the audit-office. History holds a prominent place. In 1881–1882 M. Boutmy taught constitutional history of England, of United States and of France since 1789, and M. Vergniaud that of Germany, Austro-Hungary, Belgium, Switzerland and Italy. M. Pigeonneau taught diplomatic history from 1648–1789, and M. Albert Sorel brought the same subject down to 1881. M. A. Ribot taught the parliamentary and legislative history of France from 1789 to 1852.

Louis XIII; history of England from the sixteenth to the eighteenth century; the first chapters of Richelieu's *Mémoires*; economic policy of French Kings in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries; political theories of the eighteenth century; relations between France and Russia in the same century; diplomatic history from 1648–1789; condition of France at the time of the great revolution, etc.

For contemporary history there were lectures upon the nineteenth century, as a whole; upon the constitutional history of the European powers and of the United States since 1879; upon the parliamentary and legislative history of France from 1789 to 1852; upon contemporary history, etc.

There were two courses upon paleography of the Middle Ages, one upon Latin paleography, one upon romance languages for the interpretation of historic writings, and a course in bibliography and arrangement of records and libraries.

In geography there were two courses upon the Periplus of the Euxine, of Arrian, one upon the origin, signification and transformations of French names of places, two upon America, etc.

No German university centre offers such a wealth of history and geography courses; but this abundance is almost waste. Each of the separate schools has its own premises, its corps of professors, its library, its numerous subordinates, and its separate fund, a division of force which leads to much waste and to the double outlay which the foreign visitor remarks with surprise and understands only when the history of the successive creation of all these similar institutions is explained.

After this first impression, divided between admiration and surprise, I was pleased to discover that a clearly defined movement toward concentration is beginning among the scattered members of the history body. In 1880 the examinations for the degree and fellowship in history grouped professors and students of all categories under the same banner. As M. Lavisse proudly stated it in his opening lecture in December, 1880: "This is, indeed, a school of history, founded upon the common ground of

the Faculty of Arts, the Normal School, the School of Charters, and the Practical School; a school which shall lack no care and which ought to contribute to the advancement of national instruction and of the science of history in France."[1] And with what enthusiastic good-will have masters and pupils put themselves to the work! A noble spirit animates them all; they breathe confidence and hope in the very air; the new generation is marching steadily towards its coveted ideal. M. Gréard, vice-provost of the *Académie de Paris*, remarked it with delight in his official report in 1881: "Where we provided only the place, they have taken possession and entrenched themselves for the campaign. They have built barracks. The teaching has invaded the library, where it lives peaceably in pigeon-holes, book-shelves and corners. . . . But what characterizes this period of development is perhaps less the multiplication of lectures and examinations than the direction which the advanced instruction of to-day, with its new spirit, is taking. It is the very foundation of our study that is being changed." And with perfect insight, M. Gréard showed that the origin of the practical and scientific tendency could be traced to *L'École pratique des hautes études*: "We may say that in 1868 this thought was first embodied by the institution of the school for advanced study. This school grouped around its eminent masters, galaxies of disciples who have since become masters in their turn. It inaugurated the great movement of research in epigraphy, linguistics and history . . . which has furnished science with so many precious elements."

The specialization of the history degree, the institution of masters' and fellowship prizes, the organization of special examinations, the creation of a little historical institution in the wooden barracks at Gerson Hall,[2] constitute so many steps in the new path. And the impetus once given, the movement

---

[1] *Revue internationale de l'Enseignement* for 15th February, 1881.

[2] M. Lavisse, in his opening lecture in October, 1882, said to his pupils: "Be assured that you are at home here, that these barracks are yours, ours."

has gradually increased. "To the fellowship-holders," said M. Gréard, "are added assistant masters, delegates from the *lycées* of Paris, young college professors, crowding to the Academy from great distances every Thursday,[1] and every day when they can leave their classes. Those who cannot make the trip send their work, the subject of which has been assigned them." On the 8th of last December, not less than 125 students might be counted who had enrolled themselves for the degree and fellowship examinations at Paris.[2]

The academies of the country have, in their turn, been drawn into the movement. Thanks to the kindness of M. Marais de Beauchamp, chief-clerk of the minister of public instruction, and to M. Léon Bayet, professor at the Faculty of Arts in Lyons, I gained some general information upon history movements outside of Paris. There are fellowships in history in several Faculties. I cannot enumerate the masters' prizes; but the fellowship prizes, which are less numerous, are as follows. In 1881-1882, while at Paris there were twelve, at Clermont there were five, four at Lyons, two at Bordeaux, one at Nancy and one at Douai. The professors in the provinces continue to give public lectures, but they also give courses closed to the public. They generally give one of the former to two of the latter. They have added lecturers to aid in this new work.

It is interesting to know what was the history instruction in 1882 in the Faculties that offer fellowships. Bordeaux had one professorship of history, one of geography, one of Greek and Latin antiquities, but possessed no lecturers. Lyons had two chairs of history, one of antiquities and one of geography.

---

[1] Thursday is the holiday in secondary schools in France.

[2] *Revue internationale de l'Enseignement* for 15th December, 1882, p. 581. These 125 history students are also candidates for professorships in secondary schools. Among them are some pupils from the School of Charters, and even several law students. (See address at the opening of the history and geography courses at the Faculty of Arts in Paris, by M. Lavisse, Thursday, 31st October, 1882, p. 509 of the same Review.)

Douai had one chair of history and a lecturer for geography. Nancy had two chairs of history, one of which included geography and a lecturer for Latin and Greek antiquities. Clermont had one chair of history and geography and one lecturer for history.

As a specimen I will give here the exact history programme of the *Faculté de Lyon* in 1882–1883. Besides the public lectures of M. Bayet upon mediæval history, of M. Belot upon modern history and M. Berlioux upon geography, the degree and fellowship lectures in history include geography of Europe and Northern Africa by M. Berlioux, later modern history by M. Belot, Greek history by M. Bloch, mediæval history by M. Bayet, elements of geography by M. Clédat, practical exercises, lectures in history and geography by the candidates, corrections of pupils' work[1] and lectures upon the subjects of the examination paper. They are certainly far from having the rich abundance of the Paris courses; but the impulse has been given and each college throughout France is in a fair way to become an historical laboratory, where masters and pupils shall devote themselves to correct methods for the sake of the advancement of science and of pedagogy. But such a result must not be dreamed of for ten years yet.

After having permitted my enthusiasm to run away with me, however, I must consider whether there are not some shadows in the picture. "The examination weighs heavily upon study; it is too omnipresent," said one of the men that are identified with

[1] These works are written upon subjects appointed by the professors and by the use of original documents. Some of the subjects from the Middle Ages given this year by M. Bayet are as follows: Relations of Hincmar with Charles the Bald and his sons; Investigations in Richu, the information he gives upon the development of feudal institutions; Compare the testimonies of Latin and Greek historians in regard to the relations between Alexis and the crusaders; Compare the principal Latin and Greek accounts of the capture of Constantinople in 1204. There were eight students, holders of scholarships and others, enrolled at the Faculty of Lyons for the examination and nine for the master's degree in history.

the new reforms. I was struck with these words, apparently betraying a certain discouragement. Upon reflection, I have concluded that here is a considerable fault of system. The examination for the master's degree is, and ought to be, a test of general knowledge. But is not the fellowship examination burdened by too much stress upon general knowledge? It exacts from the candidates four written papers, upon ancient, mediæval and modern history and upon an unprepared subject, each of which must be treated in six hours. Could anything be less scientific?

Listen to M. Lavisse's[1] complaints to his pupils in 1880:

"I remember when I was candidate for the fellowship examination, and more recently when I saw the students of the third year at work at the Normal School. At the beginning of the year the students go bravely to work. From morning till night there is no respite. They aid one another, but far the greater part of the work must be done alone. The study-hall is littered with books from the dismantled shelves of the library; drawers are filled with note-books; the student is always reading and as constantly writing. His comrades of other courses, especially of the philosophical courses which require less burdensome work, rail at him as a grind. Still he keeps on. History has, thank God, a charm so potent that its wearer cannot faint under fatigue; the hope of soon emerging to a vast horizon sustains the pilgrim, staff in hand, upon the rugged mountain's side. But weariness hinders him, and I have known scarcely one destined historian who has not at some stage yielded for a moment to discouragement. The time quickly comes, when the student, after glancing over the questions that first attract him perceives that he can hope to know scarcely the surface of them. And already he is besieged by a multitude of questions, of less importance, but all of which, as the phrase goes, 'might be asked.'

"'Sir,' is asked of the master, 'do you think such and

[1] *Revue internationale de l'Enseignement*, for 15th February, 1881.

such a question could be asked?' and the master cannot always answer no. The moment comes when the student feels himself swamped; he loses his head. Then he gets up lists of Egyptian kings, Turkish sultans, towns associated in the Hanseatic League, and he goes feverishly from the *epigoni* of Alexander to those of Charlemagne, from the Samnite War to that of the Roses, from the tributaries of the Danube to those of the Mississippi, from Hanno and Pythias to Livingstone and Nightingale and Marco Polo. From books he descends to abstracts and from abstracts to text-books. He began by reading Curtius, Duruy, Grote, Guizot, Mommsen; he ends with the repertoire of an academic student. He takes the curriculum of a *lycée*, marks with a cross the twenty or thirty subjects of which he is master and leaves a hundred of which he does not know a word. He goes to the examination overworked, and what is worse, fallen into detestable habits, which will always mislead him and give him a distaste for honest work."

Admitting that this sad picture is somewhat overdrawn, in principle it is unfortunately true. The professors who see their students overwhelmed by the general part of the examination, kindly simplify their work for them by the explanation of authors and preparation for theses. It was, however, not the students who did the scientific work when I visited the lectures in 1882: it was M. Rayet who explained Pausanias, M. Perrot, Arrian, M. Bouché-Leclercq, the second oration of Cicero against Rullus, and M. Thévenin, the Chapters of Montesquieu. Likewise the theses upon Roman agrarian laws were not in reality prepared by the students, but by M. Bouché-Leclercq, those upon the Popes and the Carlovingians by M. Roy, and those upon the condition of France in 1789 by M. Pigeonneau.

There is another thing. The too great scope of the subjects for theses and the texts to be expounded, makes it necessary for the professors, in order not to over-burden their pupils, to examine too superficially upon the subjects in the programme, whence it follows that both masters and pupils are subjected

to the impossibility of doing truly scientific work. Even in their theoretical courses, the professors, compelled to keep in mind the general instruction of the candidates, reluctantly take up periods of history too extensive to be studied deeply and carefully. The organization of the fellowship course is thus practically a serious hindrance to the advance of historical instruction in the *Facultés*.

If now we consider what it is that gives value to the historical instruction of Germany, we are struck with its great advantage over France in the number of practical courses, where scientific method is taught by the study of a single, much-restricted topic, all the elements of which are passed in review by the aid of the very documents from which they are derived, the pupil coming much oftener to the front than does the professor. These are the only proper laboratories for the science of history. Where in all Paris can they be found save at *L'École des hautes études?* M. Lavisse himself has had to give up, for the time being, practical exercises at the *Faculté*.

But it is not necessary to magnify the evil. The requirements of the history examinations are not unchangeable, and they will certainly be changed. Freed from their nightmare, professors and students will breathe again and work for the sake of science without the preoccupation of the examination. Practical courses will be multiplied, and the revolution begun under our eyes will soon bear all its fruit.

It does not require an inspired prophet to predict for France the rise of a brilliant school of historians, who, true to their national spirit of harmony, will be able to hold the balance steady between foundation and structure, between analytical study of detail and philosophical synthesis.

Notes supplementary to the Johns Hopkins University
Studies in Historical and Political Science, 1890, No. 3.

EARLY PRESBYTERIANISM IN MARYLAND.

By Rev. J. WILLIAM McILVAIN.

The object of this monograph is to give an account of Presbyterianism, as it existed in the early days of Maryland. The period covered by this expression extends from the founding of the colony to the year 1706, the date of the formation of the first presbytery. At this time the Presbyterian church in America entered into a new phase of her existence, one which is more generally known and much more easily studied.

In writing an account of the Presbyterians in Maryland prior to 1706, a great difficulty presents itself at the very outset. This is the entire absence of any church records. All that we know of the existence of any church organization is to be gathered from a few meagre hints in the public documents of the colony, an occasional letter, or a passing notice by some secular historian. So fragmentary is the knowledge gathered from these sources, that the historian longs for the skill of the geologist, who is able to reconstruct for us the living animal from a single bone.

Another complication arises from the fact that it is difficult to distinguish between the Presbyterians and the Independents, both of whom were embraced under the term Puritan. In England, as is well known, they formed two parties. In Maryland also there exists in some instances a clear distinction between them. Not infrequently, however, they must be treated as forming one party.

The germs of Presbyterianism came into the colony at a very early period of its existence; possibly with the arrival of the Ark and the Dove. We learn from the letter of Henry Moore, the Provincial of the Jesuits writing from Rome in 1642 that "in leading the colony to Maryland by far the greater part were heretics."[1] Presbyterianism, it is true, did not yet exist in an

[1] *Records of the English Province, S. J.*, Parts V–VIII, p. 364. See also Lord Baltimore's letter to the Privy Council, 1677, which speaks of a great part of the early colonists being non-conformists. *Archives of Maryland*, Council Proceedings, 1667–1688, p. 267.

organized form in England. Yet in the large towns, especially in London, there were a number of congregations of such decided Presbyterian tendencies, that their members might fairly be called Presbyterians. From London, afterward the stronghold of Presbyterianism, many of the mechanics and servants came. It is certainly very possible, if not probable, that some of these came from the congregations of the divines, who afterwards sat in the Westminster Assembly. To mention some of the early colonists who were known to be Presbyterians, Walter Beane, or Bayne, and his brother Ralph were evidently members of that party. William Stone, appointed governor by Lord Baltimore after the triumph of the Parliamentary party in England is known to have had decided leanings in the same direction.

The proportion of the Presbyterians to the rest of the colonists is something which can not be definitely determined. There are good reasons, however, for believing that their numbers were very considerable, larger indeed than has been generally supposed. Because Lord Baltimore and some of the more prominent of the men in the colony were Roman Catholics, it has often been taken for granted that the majority of the colonists were of the same faith. This is so far from being true, that it will be evident to any one, who will study the early history of Maryland, that almost from the very beginning the overwhelming majority of the colonists were Protestants. This majority soon assumed the political control.[1] Of this majority a very large number must have been Puritans.[2] Take, for example, the assembly which passed the famous Act concerning Religion, the large majority of the members were Protestants. And of the Protestants, a large number were Puritans.[3] This we conclude from what we know of the individual members, from the letter of Lord Baltimore to the Privy Council in 1677, from

---

[1] "The Assembly in Maryland (of 1638), composed with few exceptions of heretics." *Letter of More, English Province, S. J.*, p. 365.

[2] Lord Baltimore's letter, quoted above, speaks of "a great part" of early colonists as "such as could not conform in all particulars to the laws of England relative to Religion," such persons must have been either Roman Catholics or Puritans.

[3] Hammond, *Leah and Rachel* (1656), pp. 22–23. Force's *Tracts*, Vol. III. See Bozman, Vol. II., p. 354.

contemporary testimony, and from the language of some of the acts passed by them. The Act itself is plainly a compromise between a Roman Catholic Lord Proprietor and his Protestant subjects.[1] That the idea originated with Lord Baltimore himself, is more than probable. He was a very prudent man, and to have attempted anything else than granting entire freedom of conscience to the people of Maryland would have been an act of the most consummate folly under the circumstances. His policy from the beginning had been complete religious toleration. Such a policy was rendered more imperatively necessary by subsequent events. The Presbyterian church had been declared the Church of England by the Parliament. The Puritans were in entire possession of the state. He himself was not in good repute with the government. The passing of such an act at such a time was a most masterly stroke of policy on his part as tending to remove all suspicion from himself, and making the state of affairs in religious matters in Maryland conform as far as possible to that in Puritan England, and at the same time securing liberty of worship for the members of his own church. A compromise had recently been entered into by the Roman Catholics, Lutherans, and Calvinists of Germany in the famous Treaty of Westphalia, by which they had all secured religious toleration. Might not a similar law in Maryland secure similar results?

And may we not learn something of the religious situation in Maryland from the language of the Act itself? We think so. The main object of the law was to secure liberty of conscience to all Roman Catholics on the one hand, and all orthodox Protestants on the other. One section is particularly significant, the one which punishes the calling of names "in a reproachful manner relating to matter of religion." It would appear from this, that there was danger of this kind of thing in the province. Indeed there was a great deal of bitterness of feeling upon this very subject. A list of the names of religious parties is given, which must not be used reproachfully, and it is curious to notice that they embrace only those which would be applied to Roman Catholics or Puritans.

---

[1] This seems clearly to be the view taken by Hammond, a friend of Lord Baltimore. His tract was written against the Puritans in Maryland.

This can scarcely be an accident. Is it not a fair inference, especially when we have other proof upon the same subject, that a very large number of the Protestants of the province at that time consisted of those who might be reproached with the fact, that they were "Puritans, Independants, Prespiterians, Lutherans, Calvenists, Anabaptists, Brownists, Antinomians, Barrowists, Roundheads, Separatists?" Still another section of the Act throws, we think, some light on the situation; that which punishes any person "that shall prophane the Sabbath or Lord's day called Sunday by frequent swearing, drunkenness, or by any uncivill or disorderly recreation, or by working on that day, when absolute necessity doth not require it." This is the language not of the Roman Catholic, nor of the Anglican, but of the Westminster divines. It is possible that Lord Baltimore might have used such language purposely in drawing up the law, in order to propitiate the powers that be. But is it not more likely, that this wording had its origin in the Assembly itself, where there were some freemen, who would not hesitate to add to or alter any law proposed by the Lord Proprietor? At any rate the Act gave to Maryland a Sunday law modeled on a strict Puritan Sabbath.

The strength of the Puritan party in the province will further appear from the fact that after the Commonwealth was firmly established, they proceeded to take possession of the government, and pass laws contrary to the well known wishes of the Lord Proprietor. Among them was a new Act concerning Religion, which undid the generous provisions of the former one, and restricted the liberty of public worship to those who were neither "Papists, Prelatists," nor Antinomians, in other words, to the Puritans. The language used is of interest as showing, that there were divisions in that party, and therefore that Presbyterians as well as Independants were included under its provisions. The fact that the Puritan government lasted for a number of years shows that they must have had the majority of the colonists on their side in their political if not in their religious sympathies.

The presence of so many Puritans in Maryland will scarcely be thought strange, when we remember all the circumstances in the case. Lord Baltimore had always pursued the policy of toleration, and had invited some of the Puritans of New England to

settle in his dominions. A glance at England will also show us that the Established Church was Presbyterian. The middle classes, from whom the colonists would mainly be drawn, were in sympathy with the Puritans. The towns from which came the merchants who traded with Maryland were the centers of Presbyterianism. Some of these who are mentioned as trading with the colony are known to have been connected with prominent Presbyterian families in England.[1] Scotch emigrants had begun to arrive, and these were of course Presbyterians.

Of the large number of Presbyterians in the colony at a somewhat later time we have strong proof in the testimony of Lord Baltimore himself. There was in 1677 some talk in the Privy Council of England of establishing the Church of England in Maryland. This Lord Baltimore resisted earnestly. In a letter addressed to them dated July 19, 1677, he writes, "The greatest part of the inhabitants of that province [three of four at least] do consist of Praesbiterians, Independants, Anabaptists and Quakers, those of the church of England as well as those of the Romish being the fewest, so that it will be a most difficult task to draw such persons to consent unto a law, which will compel them to maintain ministers of a contrary persuasion to themselves."[2] That Lord Baltimore speaks with knowledge and authority can not be doubted, for in his letter he goes into several particulars in regard to the religious state of the province. He speaks of their building churches or meeting houses, and maintaining their ministers by voluntary contributions. This gives us valuable testimony to the presence of a large number of Puritans including of course Presbyterians in Maryland at that date. This statement is further borne out by the letters of members of the Church of England, which speaks of the small number of their clergy and their inadequate support. A number of minor facts point in the same direction.

Indeed it is apparent that we must so far modify our conception of the religious life in early Maryland as to believe that for

---

[1] As for example Benjamin Whichcote, merchant, a relative of the famous Dr. Whichcote.

[2] *Archives of Maryland*, Council Proceedings, 1667–1688, p. 133.

a long series of years, extending from the rise of the Commonwealth to the revolution of 1688 or perhaps to the reign of Queen Anne, the majority of the people of the colony were decidedly Puritan in their sympathies. In Maryland there was also a rise and fall of Puritanism, a sort of picture in miniature of the great struggle in England.

We have shown then that the existence of Presbyterians in considerable numbers in Maryland can not be doubted. But when we come to the question of church organization, the matter is involved in great obscurity. Protestant ministers were very few in number for many years after the founding of the colony. There was no one to provide for them, as there was in the case of the Roman Catholic priests. For awhile any church organization must have been an extremely difficult matter. No doubt there were private meetings in the various houses conducted by laymen, a form of worship very congenial to the Puritans. There does not seem to have been any church organized by the Presbyterians prior to the arrival of Doughty, the first minister of that church to visit the province, which was somewhere about 1657.

There are some who think that we ought to date the existence of organized Presbyterianism with the arrival of the Puritans at Providence, now Annapolis. But it is evident that these were of the Independant party.[1] They had indeed elders, but so had many of the New England churches. Hammond, who knew them in Maryland, says that they were Independants.[2] The fact that many of them afterward became Quakers,[3] would also seem to indicate that they belonged to the extreme wing of the Puritan party rather than to the conservative Presbyterians. Certain it is, that while Quakerism was subsequently strong in Anne Arundel County, no discoverable trace of Presbyterianism can be found there at that early date.

We will date the organized existence of Presbyterianism in Maryland by the arrival of Rev. Francis Doughty, the first

---

[1] Their minister in Virginia, Harrison, was an Independant.

[2] *Leah and Rachel*, p. 22.

[3] Randall's *A Puritan Colony in Maryland*, pp. 41–42. Also Neill's *Terra Mariae*, p. 148.

Presbyterian clergyman known to have visited the colony. His story reads like a romance. It is almost an epitome of the church history of that stormy time. He is believed to have been the son of an alderman of Bristol,[1] who while holding the living of Sodbury in Gloucestershire was ejected by the high church bishop, in 1625, ostensibly for speaking treasonable words against the king. Like thousands of other Puritans, he fled the country and came to America. He first appears in America about the year 1637, where we find him settled at what is now Taunton, Massachusetts.[2] There he lived and preached. But he soon found that things were not much smoother there than they were in England. In 1640, the Independant ministers of Boston sent down two of their number to be the pastor and teacher of a church, which they organized at Taunton. From these Doughty received but scant courtesy. Doughty preached a sermon in which he laid down the law as to whose children were to be baptized. It was the Presbyterian doctrine upon the subject, but it does not seem to have commended itself to the approval of Master Hooke and Master Stout. So, according to Lechford, "Master Doughty was overruled, and the matter carried somewhat partially as it is reported."[3] Doughty thinking no doubt that he had some rights as having already labored in the field, and that possession was nine points in the law, was inclined to resist. Whereupon the Boston ministers appealed to the magistrate. "The magistrate commanded the constable, who dragged Master Doughty out of the Assembly. He was forced to go away with his wife and children."[4] This was certainly a highhanded proceeding, and exhibits a union of church and state, which seems strange to our generation. That Doughty had the right on his side appears from the fact that Richard Smith, one of the elders and a number of others went into exile with him.

He emigrated to New Amsterdam. Here again new trials awaited him. A contemporary speaking of his leaving New Eng-

---

[1] Neill's *Founders of Maryland*, p. 118.
[2] Emory's *History of Taunton*, Vol. I, p. 19.
[3] *Plain Dealing, &c.*, Thomas Lechford, 1641, p. 54.
[4] *Plain Dealing*, page 41.

land to avoid trouble, says: he had put himself "under the protection of the Netherlanders in order that he might, according to the Dutch Reformation, enjoy freedom of conscience, which he unexpectedly missed in New England,"[1] but adds: "he found that he had gotten out of the frying pan into the fire." The director Kieft granted him a patent of land with manorial rights on Long Island, where Newtown now stands. But this colony was broken up by the Indian wars, and the church there scattered. He then came to New Amsterdam, and gathered a congregation of the English inhabitants of the place. He seems to have been the first English clergyman, who ever preached regularly in New York. Soon a new trouble overtook him, this time for political reasons. His daughter had married Adrian Van der Donk, the principal lawyer of the colony and a political rival of Stuyvesant. There soon arose trouble about the grant of land on Long Island. Doughty was arrested for debt, and only released on the condition, that he would not give the authorities any trouble. One can not help surmising that Doughty was not a very prudent man to get himself into all these troubles. In each case however he had some very warm friends, who have left their testimony, that he was badly treated by those in authority.

After his release Doughty resided with his daughter, the wife of Van der Donk. In 1655 his son-in-law died, and shortly afterward he went with his daughter and other members of his family into "the English Virginias."[2] Perhaps he was afraid to remain with the Dutch after the death of his powerful protector, or he may have well been induced to go to Maryland by the freedom of conscience, which was enjoyed in that province. Some while before August 1657 he left for Maryland. He was well received there, purchased land,[3] and enjoyed the freedom for which he so longed. Just how long he remained in Maryland we have not been able to discover. He appears several times in the year 1659, once as a witness of Governor William Stone's will, whose sister Ann he had married. We have only vague reports of what he

---

[1] Holland's *Documents*, Vol. I, p. 305.
[2] *Doc. History New York*, III, p. 106.
[3] Of Giles Thompkins, Jan. 1659, Liber S, 1658–1662, p. 340.

did in his capacity as a clergyman. His headquarters were at Nanjemoy, Charles County, where Stone resided. It is probable that he gathered a church at that place. Clergymen were scarce in the province, and his services would be gladly accepted. We know how zealous he had been in New England and in New York. Although he was now an old man, he was still vigorous enough to go about the country preaching and baptizing. We find him holding services in Accomac County, Virginia. His daughter the widow of Van der Donk, married in Maryland Hugh O'Neill. The place and date of his death, we have not been able to discover. His widow died in Maryland 1683.[1] The traces of his work in Maryland are provokingly small. It is however highly probable that he was the first pastor of the first Presbyterian church in Maryland. It is a pleasure to note that the liberty of conscience, which he had so long sought, but sought in vain, Doughty at last found in the liberal-minded religious policy, which made Maryland a place of refuge for all victims of ecclesiastical tyranny.

His successor in the work was Rev. Matthew Hill. His story is better known to us than that of Doughty. Hill's history is given at some length in Calamy's Non-Conformist's Memorial.[2] He was a native of York. He graduated at Magdalene College, Cambridge, and was noted for his knowledge of Hebrew. Ordained at York in 1652, he obtained the important living of Thirsk, Yorkshire, whence he was ejected for non-conformity in 1662. For awhile he was extremely poor. He managed to eke out a living by a private chaplaincy, but in 1666 he lost his little all in the great fire of London. In a letter at this time he subscribes himself: "Your brother *sine re, sed non sine spe.*" We quote from Calamy, "He had several relations who from the first pressed him to conformity; but no necessities could tempt him to think of offering violence to his conscience. At last, though he had a very tender constitution, he determined upon a voyage to the West Indies. [Maryland was presumably one of the West Indies in those days.] He embarked with little besides a few

---

[1] Ann Doughty was almost certainly his widow. See her will, Liber G (Wills), p. 210.

[2] Calamy's *Non-Conformist Memorial*, London, 1803, Vol. III, p. 471.

clothes, a Bible, a concordance and a small parcel of MSS. He fixed at Charles County in Maryland in 1669, where a brighter scene began to open, and he had a prospect of considerable usefulness in the ministry and of a good advantage in temporal respects. But new troubles arose, which greatly disappointed his hopes; so that it may be said as truly of him as of most in modern times, that 'through many tribulations he entered into the kingdom of God.' He was a man of ready abilities, a serious, warm and lively preacher, and of free and generous spirit."

We are able to supplement this account of Calamy by several facts found chiefly in the colonial records. The most important of these facts are given in a letter to the celebrated Baxter, dated April 3, 1669.[1] [It would seem from this letter that Hill had reached Maryland somewhat earlier than 1669, although Calamy may be correct in assigning that date for his arrival.] The letter is a very interesting one. It appears that Baxter had furnished Hill with the means of paying his passage. He begins by gratefully acknowledging this kindness. "I am sure that the blessing of him that was ready to perish doth reach you though at this distance; what you have lost in your purse, I hope that you will regain in a better place." He gives a very favorable account of the people among whom he is called to labor, whom he calls "a loving and willing people." He speaks of the fact that, "under his lordship's government we enjoy a great deal of liberty and particularly in matters of religion." He also speaks of a large number of those of the reformed faith, and adds that they have no fondness for "the liturgy or ceremonies," which agrees with what we have already quoted from the statement of Lord Baltimore. He begs Baxter to use his influence in sending out three ministers, who should itinerate among the people, who are "as sheep without a shepherd." Then he does a little begging on his own account for a few books, a very natural request for a bookless minister in a bookless province. At the close of the letter he remarks that he will have to wait for any salary until the tobacco harvest, "which is the only current money of our province." That Baxter responded favorably to the letter is evident from the

---

[1] *American Presbyterianism*, Briggs, Appendix VIII.

fact, that that a considerable number of books are found in the inventory of Hill's goods.

His lot in Maryland, for a time at least, was a very pleasant one. Shortly after the penning of his letter, he married Edith, the daughter of Walter Bean or Bayne,[1] one of the wealthiest planters of the county. The lady was a widow, for she had already with a vast show of love and theology espoused Jonathan Marles in a marriage vow couched in strongly Puritanical language, which is one of the curiosities of the early records of the province.[2] In addition to this he obtained a grant of an estate, which he called Popleton[3] in memory of a village near York, where Dr. Sherwood his instructor in theology had resided. The estate is in the neighborhood of Port Tobacco, and is still known by that name. He signs himself Matthew Hill, Gentleman.

His peaceful career was interrupted by what Calamy calls "fresh troubles," the nature of which, however, he does not state. These troubles probably grew out of the arrival of George Fox, the celebrated Quaker preacher, and the large number of proselytes whom he gained. There was great bitterness of feeling in those days between the unordained ministers of the Society of Friends, and the ordained minister, whether Anglican or Presbyterian. Hill had encountered much opposition from the Quakers in his parish in England. And upon their arrival in great force in Maryland the conflict begun in England, would naturally be renewed. No doubt the doctrine of the unlawfulness of a hireling ministry interfered, possibly seriously, with the support of those who had to look entirely to the voluntary contributions of their parishioners. Whatever these troubles may have been, his delicate health must have added very much to them. After ten years of labor, the results of which we can only conjecture, Hill died in 1679. We are in possession part of legal documents,[4] which show that he

---

[1] Mentioned in Bean's Will, dated April 10, 1670.

[2] Article by the author in *Magazine of American Church History*. Volume for 1890, p. 91.

[3] See Liber 16 (Land office, Annapolis), p. 421.

[4] Oct. 7th, 1679. Elinor Bayne appears in behalf of the orphan children of Matthew Hill, who died intestate. See Liber 17 (1679), p. 214 (Wills office), Annapolis.

left children, and a considerable estate,—a part of which was a library of seventy volumes.

Thus we see that for some twenty years at least the Presbyterians of Charles County were supplied with regular preaching, with an interval of five or six years, possibly less, between Doughty and Hill. Doughty undoubtedly preached in other parts of the State, as on the Eastern Shore. Perhaps Hill followed his example. It was an easy matter in those days to visit in a small vessel nearly all the parts then settled of the province. It has been customary to regard Somerset County, where Makemie, Traill and others preached in 1683 and even earlier as the cradle of American Presbyterianism. But it is now evident that nearly a quarter of a century earlier Presbyterianism had been planted on the Western Shore of Maryland by Doughty and maintained successfully by Hill. The liberty in the matter of religion of which Hill speaks in his letter was undoubtedly the cause of this. The Presbyterians could not lay any special claim to the sympathies of those in power in any of the colonies, as for example the Independants could in New England, the Episcopalians in Virginia, the Quakers in Pennsylvania, or the Dutch Reformed in New York. Hence they sought in Maryland a privilege, which they could find in no other colony, of absolute freedom of worship. Thus it happens that, at *first* on the shores of the Potomac, and *later* on the shores of the Pocomoke, we find the first attempts to organize American Presbyterianism.

After the death of Hill in 1679 the history of the Presbyterians on the Western Shore is largely a blank. Church organization continued as we learn from such incidental proofs as the following. In 1683 Peter Archer died, leaving a plantation and the services of a negro man "towards the maintanance of a godly minister and the good of his church."[1] He names as one of his executors Ninian Beall, a well known Presbyterian elder. What was done by the Presbyterians to carry out this bequest it is impossible to say. But that there was an organization among the Presbyterians, which continued after the death of Hill can scarcely be doubted. The government in the individual church under the Presbyterian

[1] Liber 4 G (1682–88), p. 19.

form of government, is the session or board of elders. Where they exist, a church exists. Now we know that such elders did exist, and we know the name of at least one of them. It is very improbable, that after a number of years of organized existence, the Presbyterians would allow all traces of such organization to disappear. Godly ministers such as Archer desired being hard to procure, some prominent laymen would come forward, and keep the church together, until a suitable minister could be found.

Such a man we find in Ninian Beall,[1] a well known planter in the province, and prominent in military affairs. Coming to Maryland in 1657 a poor mechanic, he rose at last to be a wealthy planter, a brave soldier, whose services were rewarded by a special grant from the Assembly, and one of the founders of manufactures in the colony in the shape of flour mills and iron furnaces. He is also very interesting from his connection with the church history. He was in Maryland when Doughty arrived. And living to a great age [he died in 1717, aged 92], he was well acquainted with the men who formed the first presbytery. He may lay claim to be called the father of Presbyterianism in Maryland, indeed in America. He was present at its birth, sustained it in the days of its weakness, and gave it a handsome endowment of land at Upper Marlboro or Patuxent. He lived to see a single church grow into a vigorous synod. That he was an elder we know, and it is almost certain that he is the "ancient and comely man, an elder amongst the Presbyterians," who entertained Thomas Wilson, the famous Quaker preacher at his house in 1692.[2] Who were the clergymen, who preached to the scattered flock on the western shore of the Chesapeake after the death of Hill, is not known. That there were preachers, not of the church of England, who could have performed this service we know from incidental references. Such a reference we find couched in very contemptuous terms in the letter of the clergy of Maryland to the bishop of London, dated May 18, 1696, which speaks of "a sort of wandering pretenders to preaching that came from New England and other places, which deluded not only the Protestant dissenters from our church,

---

[1] See article by author, *Presbyterian Review*, Vol. IX, p. 380.
[2] *Life of Thomas Wilson*, Friends' Library, Vol. II, p. 326.

but many churchmen themselves, by their extempore prayers and preachments, for which they were admitted by the people, and got money of them."[1] We find two such "wandering pretenders" in the persons of Mr. Davis and Mr. Bartlett on the Western Shore, but of what denomination they were, it is impossible now to determine. It is quite possible, that although not Presbyterians, they may have preached for them at times. It is quite possible also, that the Presbyterian ministers, who were settled on the Eastern Shore may have paid flying visits to their brethren across the bay. It is evident, however, that until the establishment of the church of England in Maryland the number of Protestant ministers of all denominations was lamentably small.

Let us now turn our attention to the church on the Eastern Shore. This has long been regarded as the birthplace of American Presbyterianism. We have seen, however, that it was on the Western Shore that the first ministers, Doughty and Hill, first landed and established churches. This was at least twenty years before the arrival of the famous group of Scotch-Irish clergymen in Somerset County. It is true of these latter that they did their work in a more vigorous manner, and with more lasting results. The materials for their history is fortunately more abundant, although still very scanty.

Church historians have generally dated the origin of Presbyterianism in Maryland, indeed in America, with the arrival of the celebrated Francis Makemie in Somerset County in 1683. From recent discoveries we shall show that he built on foundations previously laid.

The first Puritan church on the Eastern Shore of Maryland, so far as known, was founded by the Rev. Ezekial Fogg, "practishioner in medicine and divinity," as he styles himself in his will.[2] It is doubtful whether he was a Presbyterian or Independant, but more probably the latter. We can trace his history back to 1674, when he is found preaching in Westchester county, New York.[3] His ministry in Maryland can not have been a long one, as he

---

[1] W. S. Perry's *Historical Collections*, Maryland, 1878, p. 8.

[2] Liber No. 2, 1674–1704, p. 82. (Wills, Annapolis.)

[3] Briggs' *American Presbyterianism*, p. 105.

died in January, 1680. All that we know of his work is derived from his will, which speaks of his living in Dorchester County, near the Great Choptank. This will is, by-the-by, a pleasing contrast to the usual dreary and verbose language of such documents. Indeed the style is quite sprightly, especially, where he is giving directions to his executors as to the collecting of his debts. He gives them the sensible advice "not to meddle in the law to fling good money after bad," but "by all means to take a half loaf rather than no bread." Nothing further is known of the congregation gathered by Fogg.

We now come to that very interesting group of churches planted in Somerset county by Francis Makemie and his fellow-laborers. As we have said, this is the spot to which Presbyterians have turned as the birthplace of American Presbyterianism, and Makemie has been regarded as its apostle. Recent investigations have shown that we must somewhat modify this traditional opinion. There were Presbyterian churches founded in Charles County at an earlier period. And Makemie must share his honors not only with Doughty and Hill, but also with his fellow-workers on the Eastern Shore, Traill, Wilson and Davis. If Makemie was not the first Presbyterian minister in point of time, he was undoubtedly the most prominent minister of that church in America in his generation. If not the founder of American Presbyterianism, he was at least the moving spirit in the successful effort to bind together the scattered churches into a presbytery, and thus establish the church on a firm basis.

Makemie's name is closely associated with the Eastern Shore. Yet very little of his time was really spent in Maryland. We shall give but a brief outline of his history, partly because so much of it lies outside our present purpose, but chiefly because the details of it so far as known, have been often written about, and can be found in any history of the Presbyterian Church.

Francis Makemie[1] was born near Rathmelton, County Donegal, Ireland, about 1660. He studied at Glascow, appearing there as a student in 1676. In 1681 he was examined before the presby-

---

[1] Consult Briggs' *American Presbyterianism* and Bowen's *Days of Makemie* for the following facts.

tery of Laggan, Ireland, and ordained in 1682 to go to America. This ordination was the result of a letter of "collonell Stevens in Maryland beside Virginia," who wrote from Somerset County to the presbytery for a "godly minister." Makemie was probably induced to this course by Rev. William Traill, the moderator of the presbytery, who when persecution broke out in Ireland, came to Maryland himself. Makemie arrived in Somerset some time in the year 1683. In May, 1684, he left, and labored among the Puritans of Elizabeth river, Virginia, who had settled there many years previously. The probable reason for this was that there were already several Presbyterian ministers in Maryland at the time, and he went where he supposed he was most needed.

Makemie's work was mostly of an itinerant character, founding new churches and encouraging feeble ones. We find him as far South as the Barbadoes, as far North as New England. In order to support himself in these journeys he engaged in trade. It is plain, however, that he did not make money-making the chief end in this matter, but rather became a merchant as St. Paul became a tentmaker, lest he should be chargeable to his congregations. Wherever he went, he labored earnestly as a minister of the gospel. In 1690 he returned to the Eastern Shore, and settled on the border line between Maryland and Virginia. He married, and became the pastor of the church at Rehoboth in 1691. He did not remain very long, but left in 1692 for Philadelphia, and afterwards went to the Barbadoes, where he remained for several years. Again in 1698 he returned to his old home on the Eastern Shore, and made it his home until he died.

He did not stay there all the time by any means. He seems to have regarded himself as the servant of the whole church. In the interests of Presbyterianism he journeyed to the northern colonies, Pennsylvania, New York and New England. It is interesting to notice the interest which the Boston ministers took in Presbyterianism. Makemie was in constant correspondence with Increase Mather. Not content with his efforts in America he went abroad in the summer of 1704 to obtain help from the Presbyterians of England and Scotland. The ministers of that church in London raised funds to assist him, and, having obtained the means of their support for two years, he set sail for America,

taking with him two young men, John Hampton, an Irishman, and George McNish, a Scotchman. These men began to labor in Somerset County, in Makemie's old field. In the spring of 1706 Makemie succeeded in realizing his long cherished dream, and accomplished the greatest work of his life, in persuading six other Presbyterian ministers to join with him in forming the Presbytery of Philadelphia, the first Presbytery of the American Presbyterian Church. With this meeting its history as an organized body begins, and Makemie, as the originator and zealous promoter of the plan, may justly be called the "Father of American Presbyterianism." It is interesting to note that of the seven ministers who formed this Presbytery five were then, or had been, laboring in Maryland, Makemie, his two protégés, Hampton and McNish, Taylor, pastor at Patuxent, and Davis, who for several years had labored at Snow Hill. If Makemie be the father of Presbyterianism in this country Maryland was its cradle.

Makemie deserves notice as the promoter of what he regarded the material interests of Maryland. During his sojourn in London he published a book dedicated to the governor of Virginia, entitled, "Plain and friendly persuasive to the inhabitants of Virginia and Maryland for promoting towns and cohabitation."[1] There were no towns then in either colony, and Makemie had the good sense to see what a great advantage they were to the northern provinces. He naturally felt that there ought to be in the South something corresponding to Boston, New York or Philadelphia. Especially was the lack of them felt from the standpoint of religion, it being very difficult to gather congregations in the open country. The idea was an excellent one, and one which the assembly in Maryland tried several times to carry out. But the old English idea that the landed proprietor was the gentleman, and the tradesman was not, so prevailed, that villages grew up very slowly. It may be remarked in passing, that the genius of Presbyterianism was specially adapted to towns, where people met frequently, and discussed the intellectual side of religion. It certainly has always fostered the intellectual in those who professed it. One writer[2] has gone so far as to assert,

---

[1] See an account of it in Briggs, p. 139.

[2] Neill, *Terra Mariae*, p. 198.

that the reason why Presbyterianism, after so excellent a start did not make more progress in Maryland was that there were no towns to give the mental stimulus necessary to appreciate the doctrinal side of religion, which that church so prominently presents.

There is one other incident in the life of Makemie so famous and so characteristic of the period in which he lived, that, although it lies outside of his experiences in Maryland, it ought not to be omitted. This is his famous trial before Lord Cornbury, the governor of New York. Makemie and Hampton arrived in New York in 1707, and were invited by the Presbyterians to preach. The Dutch kindly offered their church. But Cornbury forbade his preaching there. So he preached in a private house in Pearl Street on January 20. Cornbury was a man, whom Bancroft describes as "joining the worst form of arrogance to intellectual imbecility." He was indeed a most intolerant bigot, and had already seized several of the Presbyterian and Independant churches, and handed them over without any legal right to the clergy of the Church of England. His trial of Makemie reads like one of the infamous assizes of Jefferys. Makemie, having the law on his side in the shape of a license to preach from the governors of Maryland and Virginia, pleaded his cause so well, that although he was treated in an arbitrary, not to say brutal manner by Cornbury, he was compelled to release him on bail. On his appearing later on for trial, Makemie was acquitted. Yet the governor in spite of it, forced him to pay all the costs of the trial, amounting to over £83, a very large sum for those days. This was one of the last events of his life. He returned to his plantation in Accomac County, Virginia, and died there in the summer of 1708. He left a large property, and a fine library, which latter he bequeathed to Rev. Mr. Andrews of Philadelphia.

Makemie's work in Maryland was but a small part of his life's work. A man of truly apostolic character, all the British colonies in America felt his influence. His works which have come down to us show him to have been a man of decided intellectual ability. To him belongs the noble distinction of those who have been martyrs for the truth. Both in Ireland and in America he showed himself willing to suffer for his faith.

Turning now to the men, who with Makemie laid the foundation of the churches in Somerset County, we come to William Traill, the most conspicuous man among them after Makemie himself. Traill[1] was born in Edinborough in 1640, the son of a Scotch clergyman, Robert Traill. After graduating from Glascow he went to Ireland, and was the pastor of a church in the presbytery of Laggan, the same presbytery as Makemie and Wilson. He was a conspicuous man, and accordingly suffered persecution for conscience sake. Upon his release from prison in 1682 he came to America, probably directly to Maryland, as he had been invited thither by Col. William Stevens. Unfortunately we know very little of his work in Maryland. We read of his buying land in the neighborhood of Stevens' place, Rehoboth,[2] and it is probable that he was the founder of that church. He seems to have been much esteemed by his parishioners, as he received bequests from John White in 1685,[3] and again from John Shipway,[4] in 1687. In Nov., 1689, he, with Wilson, Davis and other Presbyterians, signed a petition to William and Mary, asking "protection in securing our religion, lives and liberty under *Protestant Governors.*" The presence of so able a man could not but produce a great impression upon the religious life about him. Indeed, during his stay of somewhat more than seven years in Maryland, it is probable that his influence was much greater there than that of Makemie. After the revolution of 1688 he was called to Scotland, and returned there in 1690[5] to become the pastor of the church of Borthwick, near Edinboro.

We now come to the name of a man, who is little more than a name, although it is very probable that his influence in his day was a great one, the name of Rev. Thomas Wilson. There can be little doubt that he was the Thomas Wilson, pastor at Killybegs, County Donegal, where the poor man was nearly starved to death on £12 a year.[6] Still less doubt can there be, that he is

---

[1] Briggs, pp. 116–117.

[2] *Days of Makemie*, p. 137.

[3] Liber G, p. 200 (Wills). Annapolis.

[4] Liber G, p. 273 (Wills). Annapolis.

[5] The last mention of his name in this country occurs in February 1690. *Days of Makemie*, p. 180.

[6] *Days of Makemie*, p. 524.

the Thomas Wilson to whom Col. William Stevens in May 20, 1681, assigns "a parcel of land called Darby, containing 350 acres."[1] He seems to have been the first "godly minister" who accepted Stevens' invitation to come to America. To him then we owe the founding of the first of the famous Somerset County churches. His career in Maryland is unknown to us outside of the record books. Until very recently his presence in this country was unknown. He was the first pastor of the church at Manokin, now Princess Ann. He appears as its pastor in several documents, such as the will of John Galbraith, 1691,[2] the sheriff's report to Governor Nicholson in 1694, and the will of David Brown in 1697.[3] In 1695 he signs his name as a non-conformist minister to a congratulatory address sent to King William III. on his escape from assassination. In 1692[4] he declares his willingness to take the oath of allegiance, and even to conform to the church of England except in "some small matters." His brother Ephraim Wilson was sheriff of the county for several years, an ancestor of Senator Ephraim K. Wilson. There is a will dated April 20, 1702, of a Thomas Wilson,[5] but it appears to be that of his son. As he is not mentioned in the will, he was almost certainly dead at that time. These are the few bare facts of his life, so far as the writer has been able to discover them.

With these three names there is closely association the name of Samuel Davis. It is probable that he was an Irishman.[6] He came to Maryland as early as 1684, in which year he celebrated a marriage in Somerset County.[7] In September of the same year he received from Col. William Stevens a warrant to

---

[1] Land Records, Annapolis, Liber 21, p. 314.

[2] *Days of Makemie*, p. 205. [3] Liber H, p. 150, (Wills, Annapolis).

[4] A petition from Somerset County, signed by 112 persons, "praying the continuance among them of their 3 ministers, viz., one of the church of England, and the other two dissenters, only in some small matters, but willing to qualify themselves so far as in conscience they can by taking the oath of allegiance and adhering." Liber K, p. 45, Sept. 30, 1692.

[5] Liber T. B., p. 320. [6] See Briggs, p. 124 note.

[7] *Days of Makemie*, p. 114. There appears the name of Samuel Davies in 1678 as residing in Somerset County. This is possibly Samuel Davis. *Archives of Maryland*, Proceedings of Council, 1666–88, p. 98.

have laid out "500 acres called Inch, east side of the Chesapeake Bay, southeast side of the Pocomoke River, upon St. Martin's Creek."[1] His labors were in the northern and eastern parts of Somerset, extending into Delaware, where Keith says that he saw him in 1692, and where he ultimately went and settled. He was pastor of the church at Snow Hill in 1691, and how much earlier we do not know. He was probably the founder of that famous and venerable church, and continued as its pastor until 1698. His name occurs a number of times upon the colonial records, as for example among the signers of the address of congratulation to William III in 1695. In 1697 Davis and James Brechan, an Episcopal clergyman, got themselves into a disagreeable scrape at an entertainment given by Squire Layfield, where several of the party, according to their story, were "overtaken in drink." Layfield had married the widow of William Stevens, and being made a widower by her death, proposed to console himself by marrying her niece. A marriage service was jestingly performed, in which both the clergymen took part. The matter became at once a scandal, as the marriage was against the laws of England. Both the clerical gentlemen had to stand a trial in consequence. They explained that it was all a joke, and begging pardon, they were let off without the fine, which Layfield had to pay. Whether this had anything to do with Davis's leaving Maryland it is impossible to say, although he evidently thought himself badly treated in the affair. At any rate he soon moved to Hoarkill, now Lewes, Delaware, where he resided and preached for a number of years. He was one of the ministers summoned to form the first presbytery, but he does not seem to have taken a great interest in this important matter, as he only attended twice,[2] although he survived the formation of the presbytery a number of years. As the presbytery sent him word, that his excuses for non-attendance were not sufficient, we may conjecture that it was not ill health, but either indifference or his being engaged in trade, that detained him from the church courts. His name appears as one of the three ministers set apart to form the presbytery of Snow Hill in 1716. From

[1] Liber 22, p. 262 (Land office, Annapolis). The place still exists.
[2] In 1708 and 1714.

that date we lose sight of him, and the date of his death is uncertain. It is impossible to form any just estimate of his career as a minister, but from one or two hints it would appear that he was scarcely the peer intellectually or spiritually of the fellow ministers with whom his name is so associated.

The ministers who thus so successfully labored in Somerset were greatly aided by several prominent laymen, notably Col. William Stevens, at whose invitation and expense they were brought from Ireland. There were also other prominent men, such as David Brown, John White, and the leading men in fact of that section of the province. They built regular churches, not being satisfied to worship in private houses. These were but plain structures, but they had three of them, one at Snow Hill, one at Monokin, and the other, rather vaguely described as being "at the road going up along the seaside," was either Rehoboth, or possibly at St. Martin's.[1] So strong were the Presbyterians in this section, that it was with great difficulty that the Church of England found a lodgment there. In 1695 Rev. James Brechan, our friend of the mock marriage, complains that "the people will not pay him his dues, but will do so to the dissenting ministers." As late as 1711 Rev. Alexander Adams writes to the Bishop of London that he is the only clergyman of the Church of England in Somerset County, and very poorly paid, while the Presbyterian churches are carefully supplied. Presbyterianism is still strong in this section.

Returning to the Western Shore we have seen how, from the death of Hill in 1679, the history of the Presbyterian Church there is involved in great obscurity. So great is the obscurity that some have taken it for granted that there was no such thing as organized Presbyterianism until the beginning of the eighteenth century. We have tried to show that this could scarcely be the case, when so many prominent laymen were Presbyterians, and also by the fact that among the few notes on the religious condition of the country, we find at least one notice of a Presbyterian

---

[1] See note, *Days of Makemie*, p. 533. Davis's estate, called Inch, was on St. Martin's Creek, two miles north of the present village of St. Martin. Dr. Bowen, in a letter to the author, thinks this conjecture a probable one.

elder. This period of uncertainty suddenly comes to an end with the year 1704, when we discover a full-fledged Presbyterian church with a pastor and a large number of adherents at Patuxent. This is mentioned at great length in a deed giving the church a lot in what is now Upper Marlboro from Col. Ninian Beall.[1]

How long this church had been organized, it is impossible to say. So large a number of persons are mentioned as the officers of the church that it must have existed for some little time, perhaps for a number of years. It was the heir of the church that Hill founded, and Ninian Beall forms the connecting link between the two congregations. As we find the church described in this deed, it must have been a strong congregation, for sixteen men are named as the trustees, some of whom were among the most prominent men in Prince George and Charles Counties. As we find the erecting of a church spoken of in the grant, it is probable that this was their first house of worship, although the language of the latter part of the deed leaves this somewhat doubtful. We find a session of several elders, some of whom we find in the minutes of the presbytery of Philadelphia, such as James Stoddard, Alexander Beall. The parish was a very large one, extending over all of Prince George County and into Charles. Even in 1719, when the church at Bladensburg was built, and the parish divided, it included part of Charles County. Ministers had to ride far afield to visit parishioners in those days.

There was a strong Scotch element in the congregation, as the names would indicate. Probably then the church was organized strictly on the Scotch model. But there was also a strong English element, and of the three clergymen known to us as pastors of the church, all came out from London, and two, Taylor and Orme, were Englishmen.

The pastor mentioned in the deed—and probably the first pastor of the church—was Rev. Nathaniel Taylor. Very little is known of Taylor. We do not know the date of his coming to Maryland, but it was hardly much before the granting of the property by Beall. A worthless tradition says that he was a Scotchman

---

[1] For a full account of this deed discovered by the author, see Briggs, Appendix XII.

who came over in 1690, but this is plainly wrong. Another ingenious guess says that he came from New England. But of this there is no proof. An examination of the inventory of his goods,[1] which includes a fine library, reveals these two facts; that he was a bachelor, and that he had just such books as an English non-conformist clergyman of that period would be likely to have. The meagre facts so far as we have them, would seem to point to his being the son of the famous non-conformist divine, Rev. Nathaniel Taylor, who preached at Salters' Hall, London, so eloquent that he was known as the Dissenting South.[2] An intimate friend of Dr. Reynolds, who sent a number of young men to the struggling Presbyterians of America—it is quite likely that Taylor came out to Maryland, in this way, shortly after the death of his father in 1703.

The library referred to is such a fine one, that one feels much dissapointed that we know so little of the owner of these well selected 500 volumes. The man who took so deep an interest in science as to have in his library several of the most recent works by Boyle, Bently, Newton and Locke, was no ordinary man. The theological works were well chosen, containing a number of foreign authors, although naturally the writings of the Westminister Divines occupy a conspicuous place. Outside of the deed and the inventory we know nothing of Taylor, except that he took an active part in the proceedings of the presbytery, which he attended with great regularity. At his sudden death, about January 1st, 1710, he was deeply mourned by his congregation. It is probable that he was a young man, before whom lay years of usefulness. The loss of such a scholar at such a time was, no doubt, a great blow to his people. We may feel sure that it was also a great loss to the infant Presbyterian church.

With the organization of the first presbytery we bring this sketch to a close. After that date the original documents for church history are far more accessible, and the facts are generally well known. It will be well to take a glance at the state of the

---

[1] *Vide*, article by the author in the *American Magazine of Church History*. For inventory see Liber W. B. 9, p. 159.

[2] Wilson's *Dissenting Churches*, Vol. II, p. 13.

Presbyterian Church in Maryland at this date, 1706. On the Western Shore we have but one organized Presbyterian Church, the one at Patuxent. There was a considerable number of Presbyterians in Baltimore County, as is shown by the fact that soon after this they organized a church, and called a pastor. On the Eastern Shore we have the flourishing group of churches at Snow Hill, Rehoboth, and Monokin, with Makemie, Hampton, and McNish as their pastors. There were also in Cecil County a number of Presbyterians, who had not, however, yet organized. But shortly after this period we find in this part of the country, and in adjoining parts of Pennsylvania and Delaware, a number of churches organized from the Ulster Presbyterians and the remains of the churches which had been founded by the Dutch Reformed.

Small as this little group of churches was, it was by far the strongest then existing in the colonies among the Presbyterians. It seemed to have before it a great future, and that Maryland would be a stronghold of Presbyterianism. This has not been the case. To what are we to attribute its failure to fulfil this promise? I. The principal cause was undoubtedly that mentioned in a letter from the Presbytery of Philadelphia to the Presbytery of Dublin in Ireland, dated September, 1710. "Not long ago there was a probability of doing more good in Maryland before episcopacy was established by law."[1] This was the main cause, a very sufficient one for the comparative failure in Maryland after so excellent a start. No church establishment was better off, and few as well off, as that of Maryland. The clergymen were well paid, the churches built at the expense of the State. The church indeed became a department of the colonial government with the Governor at the head. Having thus plenty of money it was a comparatively easy matter to obtain ministers to fill all the parish churches. On the other hand the Dissenters in Maryland, although thanks to the interference of William III, they were granted many privileges, were yet under considerable disadvantages. It was a small matter perhaps, that they were obliged to leave their meeting houses unlocked. But when it came to making them support the clergymen of the parish as well as their own, it required considerable zeal for

[1] Published Minutes of Presbytery of Philadelphia, p. 20.

Presbyterianism for a man for conscience sake to give double tithes, especially if that man was poor. The dissenting minister was thus placed at a great disadvantage compared with his government-paid brother of the establishment.

Another fact that told against the Presbyterian clergy of the colonies was that for many years there was no college, no theological seminary for the raising up of a native ministry among them. This lack of educational machinery was particularly felt by the church, which demanded above all things that her clergy should be an educated clergy, with knowledge of Latin, Greek, and Hebrew. For awhile they were obliged to look to the mother country for their supply of ministers. In this, too, they were at a disadvantage as compared with the Episcopal Church, as the Church of England had far greater wealth and a far larger number of men in her ministry, than the Presbyterian Churches of Scotland and Ireland. Had the Presbyterians been in the decided majority in any one colony, as the Congregationalists in New England, or the Episcopalians in Maryland and Virginia, some Presbyterian Harvard or Yale would have been founded at a very early date. But unfortunately for them, they were scattered and nowhere possessed great wealth or political power. One cannot help regretting that some of the wealthy laymen of early Maryland, as Beall or Stevens, had not seen the pressing need of such an institution, and devoted some of their numerous acres to the founding of some Nassau Hall, which would have been not only the pride of the Presbyterian Church, but would have had a most important influence on the whole colony. Augustine Herman, the Bohemian Presbyterian, had some such scheme in his mind, as may be seen from his will. What a pity it was never carried out.

The colleges of New England were drawn on to a certain extent. But although in the beginning there was great cordiality and considerable correspondence between the New England divines and their Presbyterian neighbors to the south, notably with Makemie, later on there grew up a coolness, possibly because there was no longer the bond of a fellowship in suffering at the hands of the English Church. At any rate it was to Glascow and Edinboro that the Presbyterians in America usually looked for their supply of ministers previous to the founding of the college at Princeton.

Another reason for the decrease of the number of Presbyterians

in Maryland must be sought in the fact, that their supply from Europe was to a great extent cut off. A glance at the history of England will help us to understand this. When Maryland was founded England was Puritan, so far, at least, as the great middle class was concerned. When the century ended, the Church of England, re-established under Charles II, had so far regained her strength that the number of dissenters was reduced to a feeble minority. A corresponding change must therefore be looked for in her colonies, and in no place perhaps more than in Maryland, where the waves of religious opinion closely followed those of the mother country. In her earliest days the tolerant policy brought persecuted Puritans to the province. Under the Puritan supremacy in England, the colonists came from the very classes most thoroughly leavened with that doctrine.

After the Restoration the religious freedom enjoyed in Maryland offered a place of refuge to the Presbyterians of England and Ireland. We need not be surprised then that such men as Doughty, Hill, Nicholet, and others found refuge from the storms of persecution in Europe in the liberally governed province, where there was liberty of conscience and no established church. For a time, even in England, there remained a strong Presbyterian element, from which the colonists to the New World would naturally be largely drawn. But times changed. There grew up a new generation, who had been educated under the Establishment, not under the preaching of the great Puritan divines. A corresponding change took place in the colonies, at least among the English settlers. The descendants of the Puritans had become admirers of the Establishment. And this cry for a similar establishment affected almost all the colonies except, of course, New England. The people of Maryland demanded an Establishment. Lord Baltimore, being a Roman Catholic, warded off any movement in that direction for a time. But the demands of the colonists grew louder and louder. Even the Presbyterians joined in these demands, or at least were not in the first instance opposed to such a scheme.[1] This may appear to us strange. But there

[1] We find such Presbyterians as David Brown, Ninian Beall, and others, signing a petition to King William for an Establishment "according to the fundamentals of the Church of England."

was such a prejudice against the Church of Rome, and such a fear, that under the liberty enjoyed in Maryland, the Roman Catholics might be taking advantages which would be denied them under an Establishment, that all the Protestants made common cause. This is less surprising, also, when we remember the terrible persecutions which the Huguenots of France were then enduring. All Protestants then believed in the union of Church and State, and the benefits of their separation under the liberal policy then adopted by Maryland were not so evident as they might have been, because of the inability of the people to support their clergy, which had resulted in a deplorable scarcity of churches. Besides all this, the people expected great things from the admirable plan submitted by Bray, and the Presbyterians were not so selfish as to oppose that which seemed so plainly for the public good. And so the Church of England became the Established Church of Maryland, and those churches which had not long before formed the majority, were reduced to dissenting sects. The Presbyterians soon discovered to their sorrow, how much they had lost by the change. But it may be doubted whether, with the great change in the religious sentiments of the English people, powerfully affecting public sentiment in Maryland, together with the evident need of some adequate provision for the support of the clergy, it was possible to prevent the English Church from becoming the established church of the colony.

It is interesting to note the difference between the action of the English Presbyterians and their Scotch co-religionists at this juncture. The first Presbyterians to come to Maryland were of English origin—Doughty, Hill, and such laymen as Bean and Stone. But English Presbyterianism never had so strong a hold on the hearts of the people as had its sister church in Scotland, which had never known any other form of Protestantism. Moreover the English divines generally held only to a presbytery which was agreeable to Scripture,[1] not strictly "jure divino." Hence it was comparatively easy to conform to the re-established church in England, and the newly established church in Maryland. The

[1] The language of the Westminster Assembly is, "It is lawful and agreeable to the Word of God."

English Puritans in Maryland generally, with the exception of the Quakers, followed the example of their brethren in the old country, as was only natural. Some few, as at Patuxent, remained faithful to the Presbyterian preferences of their ancestors. But after 1700 the English element in Maryland Presbyterianism becomes a very small one.

Quite otherwise was it with the Scotch and the Scotch-Irish. Presbyterianism had been the religion of their fathers from the time of the Reformation. It was thus hallowed to them by a thousand sacred memories. For it they had been obliged to fight and suffer terrible persecutions. It had been the object of the long and bitter struggle which had been waged against them by the monarchs of the house of Stuart, to force Episcopacy on them. Hence they hated Prelacy, as they called it, with a perfect hatred. It was only natural then that they should remain loyal to Presbyterianism, organizing churches of their own, wherever they settled in considerable numbers, and cheerfully supporting their pastors.

One reason for the failure of Presbyterianism in Maryland to grow rapidly may be found in the location of their strongest churches. Somerset County was the most remote part of the province, and was itself isolated from the rest of the world. Had the churches planted there been nearer the centres of influence, they would have had a much wider influence. The church at Upper Marlboro though alone became the mother of a number of other churches, which still exist in Prince George and Montgomery Counties.

A word or two in regard to the church buildings, style of worship, &c. Most of the churches were extremely plain, much like the "houses" described by the sheriff of Somerset County in his report, as existing at Snow Hill, and Monokin; "about thirty feet long, plain country buildings, all of them."[1] Most of the churches were built of wood, and that very roughly prepared, in some cases not having even a plank flooring. At the lower end of the church there was often a gallery, where the servants sat.

---

[1] The Rolls office, London, *Maryland Documents*, III, B. 39. Sheriffs' report from all the counties in Maryland in 1697.

In some cases the building was of better description. The church at Patuxent was of English brick, according tradition. There was an entire lack of anything like ornament. There was no organ in use in any of the churches, it being an article of luxury, and organists being very rare. The Scotch would not have used them if they could have been procured owing to the sentiment against them. The singing was conducted by a precentor, as in the Scotch Kirk, and was lined out by the minister, as few of the congregation possessed hymn books, and many could not have read them. As to the books used, we find that at Patuxent they used Tate and Brady,[1] as in the English church, but on the Eastern Shore they probably sang the psalms according to the version of Rous, in orthodox Scotch fashion. One relic of that time has come down to us in the shape of the remains of a handsome communion service of English plate made in 1707, once used at Patuxent, possibly a gift of Ninian Beall.[2]

Of the political influence of the Presbyterians residing in Maryland upon its history during the period embraced by this sketch it is difficult to say anything certainly. We have spoken of their influence in the matter of passing the famous Act concerning Religion. It is impossible to distribute the honors for that most sensible and most christian legislation at this late day. All that we contend is, that the part that the Puritans played in the matter should not be ignored, when we know that they composed a large part, if not the majority of the Assembly, which passed it.

In regard to their legislation, when for awhile they held the reins of government, only one adverse criticism can be made in regard to it, the one act where the liberty granted under the Act concerning Religion is repealed, and Papists and Prelatists excluded from the free enjoyment of their religion.[3] From our point of view this was a piece of bigotry, peculiarly unkind, after the liberality shown by Lord Baltimore. But in this act they were but applying the law passed by the English Parliament

---

[1] Taylor's library contained a number of them.

[2] The tankard and cups having been sent to the church at Bladensburgh are still in use by that congregation, now located at Hyattsville.

[3] *Archives of Maryland*, Assembly Proceedings, 1637–1664, pp. 340–341.

to the colony, a not unnatural proceeding. In regard to their attitude toward the Lord Proprietor or in secular matters they are to be admired, not condemned. It was impossible for them to have acted in any other spirit. Their party in England had overthrown the monarchy. Baltimore was practically a sovereign in Maryland.[1] No wonder then that some of them hesitated to take the oath of allegiance to him, and still others wanted to get rid of the title, "Absolute Lord and Proprietor." During the eight years that the Puritans held possession of the province, a practical democracy prevailed. The laws passed by them were of a wise nature. Even the law against "Papists and Prelatists" does not seem to have been enforced.

A decided trace of Puritanism may be found in the strict Sabbath laws passed, all of which even that of November, 1678, "for keeping holy the Lord's Day" are couched in Puritan language. The tradition in Maryland has always been for the strict keeping of Sunday. How much of this is due to the Puritan ideas of the early settlers?

There was naturally considerable feeling between the Presbyterians and the Roman Catholics, owing to the corresponding violence of feeling in Europe, where, especially in France and Ireland, the reformed churches were suffering bitter persecutions. Very little of this feeling appears, however, upon the surface in Maryland, except perhaps on two occasions. Coode, the "Titus Oates of Maryland," as he has well been called in his rebellion in 1689, managed to arouse a great deal of bitter feeling against the Roman Catholics by false reports and appeals to prejudice. He so far duped Beall, a leader among the Presbyterians, as to induce him to join his forces. But there was no general movement among the Presbyterians, and Beall himself took a much less active part in the plot than some of his companions. It would be unfair to blame the Presbyterian party generally for the action of one or two of their members. Again, the readiness with which the Presbyterians acquiesced in the establishment of Episcopacy may have

---

[1] Lord Baltimore's sovereign power was frequently complained of at a later period, as by the Episcopalians, when in 1677 he opposed the establishing of the church of England.

originated in their distrust of Lord Baltimore and his Roman Catholic friends, who would be deprived of what power they had, to a great extent at least, by the act of establishment. Yet this is but a matter of conjecture. If it existed it may have been due to a feeling of "Timeo Danaos et dona ferentes," a suspicion which was certainly justified by the conduct of James II.

After the restoration in England anything like democracy in Maryland was of course impossible. Yet the spirit which led the Puritans to demand their rights in the great civil war of England was not dead either in the old country nor in the colonies. Occasional flashes of it may be seen in Maryland, as when the Puritan Nicholet, in a sermon before the Lower House on April 26, 1669, endeavored to stir up the people to demand their rights.[1] He got a severe reproof, had to beg pardon, and quitted the province. It slumbered on until a century later, when it burst forth in the demand for liberty by all the colonies. In that great movement the Presbyterians everywhere took a most prominent part, their ministers and laymen being with scarcely an exception ardent patriots.

After the establishment of the English Church in Maryland, the number of Presbyterians was, as we have said, proportionately much smaller. But there is one legacy which the old Puritan families, whose descendants went into the English Church, left to them, which we think we can trace in the later religious history of the province. The rise in the next century of Methodism was but the reappearance of Puritanism under a different guise, and with a somewhat altered theology. The sympathy of many of the Presbyterians of this country, such as the Tennents, Jonathan Edwards, and others with this movement is well known. Whitefield came to this country, gladly welcomed by the Presbyterians. He preached in the church at Upper Marlboro, where however he found the people "in a dead sleep."[2] John and Charles Wesley had for their grandparents Presbyterian divines on both sides of the house. May there not have been a similar ancestry in Maryland, and the Methodism there be the descendant

---

[1] *Maryland Archives*, Vol. II, pp. 159–163.

[2] Letter to Noble of New York, Dec. 8th, 1739.

of early Puritanism? In no state did the early Methodists gain greater success, and this in the face of an all-powerful established church. This may be ascribed to the earnest zeal of the first preachers, to the fact that the church had suffered from the evils of establishment, where the governor was the head of the church, and also to the fact that many of the established clergy sympathized with England in the struggle with the colonies. But may not its success be in part, at least, due to a Puritan tradition within the establishment itself, coming down from the early settlers, who formed the congregations of Doughty and Hill, Fogg and Taylor?

Socially, the Presbyterians were among the best elements in forming the character of the people of Maryland. The morality preached by their ministers was of a high type. It is well known that wherever Presbyterianism has gone, it has fostered education. Its type of religion is a very intellectual one. The children in their early childhood are taught the Shorter Catechism, a body of divinity in itself. The clergy preach doctrinal sermons and expect the people to discuss at length afterward the points brought forward. The most intelligent body of men in the colonies before the Revolution was the clergy of the Presbyterian and Congregational churches. They were the ablest, almost the only educators of prominence. In this general intelligence the Presbyterians of Maryland partook as a matter of course. Although being less wealthy and powerful than some of their northern neighbors they founded no college to be the rival of Princeton, from the earliest time they took a great interest in the matter of education. One of their leaders on the Eastern Shore, Daniel Brown, showed that interest by leaving £100 to the University of Glascow. Would that he had left it to found a good school in Maryland. In the 18th century the Presbyterians founded more than one academy in Maryland, which did good work in their day. In general we may say that there were two great objects which the Presbyterian church in Maryland has always been most zealous in maintaining, a love for personal and political liberty, and the cause of popular education.